

*"We do not take possession of our ideas, but are possessed by them.
They master us and force us into the arena,
Where, like gladiators, we must fight for them."*

—HEINE.

THE ARENA

VOL. XXIX.

FEBRUARY, 1903.

No. 2.

THE ATTACK ON VENEZUELA.

BEFORE the present article reaches the reader a satisfactory settlement of the differences between Venezuela and her execution creditors may have been reached, or, at any rate, it is to be hoped that it will. However that may be, there have been developed certain phases in the transaction that are of permanent interest from the standpoint of international law and politics. There is, in the first place, the question that always arises when the same party or parties assume the rôle of complainant, judge, and executioner. While this is not permitted by municipal law, it is still permitted by international law. In this, as in certain other respects, the ethics of international law trails behind that of municipal law. Another instance of the lower code of ethics prevailing in international law is the effect of duress upon contracts: a contract between individuals is vitiated by duress, while a treaty, which is a contract between sovereign States, is not so affected.

The reason for the different standards applied to private and to international actions in these cases is to be found in the practical difficulties in the way of applying the same standard. If treaties of peace were held to be voidable upon the ground of duress, how many treaties of peace would be considered binding? So also unscrupulous governments would indulge in wholesale oppression of foreign residents and the confiscation

of their property if the rights of these residents could in no case be enforced by the country to which they owe allegiance. So far as I can find, Calvo is the only great international law writer who contends that the foreign residents of a country should have no recourse except to the courts of that country. According to this view of what should be international law, if the courts, along with the other branches of the government, become venal, the foreign resident is left without protection. This would inevitably result in large tracts of territory, nay, even some of the continents, being left undeveloped for centuries to come—because thrift, industry, and enterprise are wanting in their own citizens, and foreigners possessing these characteristics would not enter such countries if the protection of their own flag did not follow them. On the other hand, it is difficult to approve a provision of international law that violates the principle of the equality of all sovereign States in that it gives to the more powerful State a right that, as a matter of fact, cannot be exercised by the weaker ones.

As a general proposition, a law may be considered bad that is particularly susceptible to abuse in its exercise; and this is especially true of the law under consideration. For, when the appeal to force has once been made and man becomes again the human wolf, the law of the strongest is quite naturally substituted for all other codes; because it is in the very nature of man that when the circulation is quickened by conflict, when the boom of cannon and the flash of bayonet send the hot blood to the brain of the collector, the maxims of equity are swallowed up in the zeal for victory—and acts are committed that were never contemplated before the struggle begins, that would not have been resorted to against an equal or against a weaker State except in the heat of conflict, and that cannot be justified when the struggle is over and the parties have returned to a judicial frame of mind.

As between sanctioning a rule that would encourage irresponsibility on the part of one class of States and one that tends toward tyranny on the part of another class, it seems to us that there is middle ground—arbitration. This would at least be

an equitable as well as a practical method of determining upon the validity and the amount of the claims; and, as for the enforcing of the award, the objection that the arbitration tribunal could not compel payment seems to us to have more theoretical than practical force, inasmuch as solvent States would not, except in very rare cases, refuse to carry out the terms of an award—and as against insolvent States even force is impotent.

But the present controversy has raised not only the question of the rights of debtor and creditor, *i.e.*, of the parties to the quarrel, but also the rights of neutrals. This latter question grows out of the character of the blockade. If, as first announced, the blockade was to be wholly a pacific one, then the commerce of neutrals could not be interfered with. The operation would be confined exclusively to the ships of Venezuela and those of the allies. To us it seems that a pacific blockade is as much a contradiction in terms as would be *friendly hostilities*. A blockade is manifestly a war measure, regardless of any formal declaration of war. It is an appeal to force—an interference with the intercourse of a State not compatible with the coexistence of friendly relations. The frank statement of Premier Balfour that "war exists" between Venezuela and the allies not only cleared the atmosphere in the present controversy, but will no doubt go a long way toward putting an end to the use of the term "pacific blockade" as descriptive of any situation known to international law. During the continuance of the blockade not only Venezuela but neutrals will suffer because of the interruption of their commerce; and in this respect the United States is especially concerned, as her trade with Venezuela is greater than that of all other neutrals combined, and is equal to that of England, Germany, and France, our closest three competitors. Our relatively large share in the trade of Venezuela is to be accounted for in large part from the fact that we have in the Red D Steamship Line direct communication between our ports and those of Venezuela, while with several of the other South American countries we are at a disadvantage as regards transportation.

But there is involved not merely the question of debtor and creditor and the commerce of neutrals: the proceedings involve the more delicate question of the character and application of the Monroe Doctrine. Up to the present time the Monroe Doctrine has not been a part of international law—it has been simply a political policy of the United States; and, no matter how often this policy were reiterated by the United States, such reiteration would not make it a part of international law. It is not within the province of any one State to make international law: the consent of other nations is a necessary element in order to convert a national policy into a principle of international law. Yet has not the recognition of the Monroe Doctrine by England, Germany, and Italy, and their pledges not to violate it by the seizure and occupation of territory in Venezuela, changed said Doctrine from merely a national policy to a recognized principle of international law?

If not, why not? That the recognition was made reluctantly does not alter the effect. Neither does it matter that it was not made in a conference or congress of the nations: a great many of the now well-recognized principles of international law have originated outside of any conference or congress, and have never been formally sanctioned by them. In reply to the objection that it has not been unanimously recognized, and hence is not entitled to be considered as a principle of international law, we would say that very few principles of international law ever have received unanimous recognition. Even the principles enunciated at the Paris conference in 1856 have never been recognized as binding by the United States, Mexico, and Spain; yet few would contend that they are not part of international law. It may be asked what difference it makes whether the Monroe Doctrine is a principle of international law or a national policy, since it must in the ultimate analysis be maintained, if maintained at all, by force. There is this difference, which seems to us a substantial one: If it is a principle of international law the nation failing or refusing to respect it is a violator of law, and no reputable nation is anxious to acquire a reputation as a lawbreaker; while if

it is simply a national policy there is no such obligation to respect it.

As to the application of the Monroe Doctrine, the present controversy has thrown considerable light, in that it has defined it, negatively at least, as not being a shield for the purpose of enabling any nation to escape paying its just debts. It is unfortunate that there should ever have been any hope entertained that it would be so used.

It is now probable that the strife between England, Germany, and Italy and Venezuela—three whales and a wildcat—will be ended by a submission of the whole matter to arbitration. This will be doubly fortunate, as it will not only put an end to a disagreeable situation, but will also constitute a very strong and valuable precedent for the settlement of similar controversies in the future. The part played by the United States has been a very diplomatic and creditable one; it has rendered valuable service to all parties concerned. Especial credit is due to Minister Bowen for the energy, wisdom, and statesmanship he has shown in the performance of the delicate tasks intrusted to him by all parties. To him has been given an exceptional opportunity for rendering valuable service, and he has shown himself equal to the emergency.

EDWIN MAXEY.

Columbian University, Washington, D. C.

PUBLIC OWNERSHIP.

IN 1894 the Department of the Interior in Washington used the Bell telephone at a total cost of \$75 per 'phone. In 1895 the Government put in its own 'phones and the cost of the service proved to be but \$10.25—interest, depreciation, and all. After a few years the Bell concluded to give the Department reasonable rates, down close to the cost as proved by the government experiment (all the way down, perhaps, considering the distance facilities of the Bell service), and the Department went back to the Bell 'phones to get the wider service.

When the French government took the telephone in 1889, rates were at once reduced in round numbers from \$120 to \$80 in Paris, and from \$80 to \$40 in other places, except Lyons; and the charge in Paris has recently been reduced to \$60.

Public operation of the telegraph in England reduced rates at once 30 to 50 per cent., and in Switzerland public ownership and control of railroads, express companies, telegraphs, and telephones is said to have "reduced the freight rates, express charges, and tolls more than 78 per cent. below the cost for like service under private control."

When Syracuse, N. Y., changed from private to public ownership of the water supply, the family rate was reduced from \$10 to \$5. In Auburn, the rate was reduced from \$8 to \$6 when the plant was made public. In Randolph the private rate proposed was \$10, but the town built the works and made the charge \$4. Taking the whole United States, the charges of private water companies are 43 per cent. more per family than the charges of public plants, according to M. N. Baker, of New York, the editor of the *Manual of American Water Works* and the highest authority on the subject in the country.

When Hamilton, O., entered upon public operation of gas works the price was reduced from \$2 to \$1 per thousand feet. Pittsburg pays a private company \$1.20 and \$1 net, while in Wheeling, near by, the public works supply gas at 75 cents a thousand and 56 cents net (the actual cost to the people considering operation, fixed charges, and profits).

Topeka with a public plant gets her electric light at a cost of \$60 per arc—interest, depreciation, and all; while Fort Wayne, with about the same number of lights and similar service, pays \$120 an arc to a private company. Little Rock, Ark., makes her own light for \$51 per arc, while New Bedford, Mass., under substantially equivalent conditions, pays \$138 per arc to a private company. Peabody, Mass., has reduced the cost of electric light from \$185 to \$73 per arc by public ownership; Elgin, Ill., from \$228 to \$65; Detroit from \$132 to \$73 per standard arc. And these are only a few out of many cases that could be cited.

Public ownership and operation of street railways in Glasgow reduced the hours of labor about $\frac{1}{3}$, raised wages, lowered fares at once about 33 per cent. (the average fare is below 2 cents and over 35 per cent. of the fares are 1 cent each), greatly improved the service, doubled the traffic in about two years, brought down the operating cost and fixed charges so that the city makes as much profit per passenger on an average fare of 1.78 cents as the private company said it made on an average fare of 3.84 cents, and turned several hundred thousand dollars of profit into the public treasury. The 5-cent fare in our larger cities is much too high. Responsible parties have offered to operate street railways in Chicago on a 3-cent fare, and in Detroit on a 3-cent single fare with 40 tickets for \$1, taking the whole railway system of the city and paying interest on the cost of its acquirement.

One of the most striking examples of the difference between public and private ownership is to be found in a comparison of the charges on the bridge in St. Louis owned by the Goulds and those on the bridge owned by the cities of New York and Brooklyn:

CHARGES FOR CROSSING.

Private Bridge.

St. Louis Bridge (cost \$13,000,000, bought by Gould interests for \$5,000,000).

On steam cars 25 to 75 cents per passenger.

Street-car fare 10 cents, 5 cents for bridge.

Foot passengers 5 cents.
Vehicles, one horse...25 cents.
Vehicles, two horse...35 cents.
Bicycles10 cents.

Municipal Bridge.

Brooklyn Bridge (cost \$15,000,000).

On L roads 3 cents (2 fares for 5 cents) if you simply wish to cross the bridge—if you come from a distance or are going beyond the bridge it costs nothing to cross it either in the L cars or the surface cars—the ordinary carfare takes you over without extra charge.

Foot passengersFree.
Vehicles, one horse... 5 cents.
Vehicles, two horses...10 cents.
BicyclesFree.

The net earnings of the St. Louis bridge are $1\frac{1}{4}$ millions a year, or 25 per cent. on the Gould investment, and 12 per cent. on the impairable capital (the excavating of the tunnels, etc., will never have to be done over again). The St. Louis charges may be objected to, not only as extortionate, but as discriminating. A passenger who buys a ticket in New York or Philadelphia to St. Louis or beyond has to pay 75 cents for crossing the bridge; whereas if he buys a ticket to East St. Louis and then crosses the bridge in a railroad train it will cost him only 25 cents, or 10 cents if he crosses on a street-car. The St. Louis bridge is managed for private profit; the Brooklyn Bridge is managed for public service, the aim being to make the bridge as useful to the people as possible.

A normal public plant gravitates to a lower rate level than a normal private plant, because the latter aims at profit while the former aims at service, and the rate level for the greatest service is much lower than the rate level for the largest profits. Moreover, public ownership under good management is able to achieve many absolute economies, not merely making lower rates but producing at lower cost and saving industrial force. Some of the reasons for the great economies effected by public ownership are as follows:

1. Public ownership has no lobby expenses or corruption funds to provide for.
2. Nor any dividends on watered stock to pay.
3. Nor overgrown salaries or monopolistic profits.
4. Nor heavy litigation expenses and lawyers' fees.
5. It saves on interest and insurance.
6. It gains through the coördination of services, the civic interest of the people, and the higher efficiency of better-paid and more contented labor.
7. It does not have to bear the burden of costly strikes and lockouts.
8. It saves the cost of numerous regulative commissions and endless investigations into secrets of private monopoly.
9. The diffusion of wealth and the elevation of labor accompanying public ownership tend to diminish the extent and the cost of the criminal and defective classes.
10. The elimination of conflict and antagonism carries with it the cost of all the useless activities prompted by that antagonism. Legislation would cost us less, for example, were it not for the private monopolies, for a large part of the time and attention of our legislators is given to them.

Great as are the benefits of the low rates secured by public ownership, there are other and still more weighty reasons in its favor:

1. *Justice.* The outrageous discriminations in freight rates etc., that have done so much to injure honest farmers, merchants, and manufacturers and to build up the most objectionable trusts, could not exist under real public ownership of the roads. Another injustice would also vanish: the taxation without representation, and for private purposes, which the private monopolies levy upon us through excessive rates—a taxation by the side of which King George's efforts were insignificant decrepitudes.

2. *Good Government.* It is matter of common knowledge

that the great private monopolies constitute the most corrupting influence in our politics to-day. The public ownership of monopolies will remove that influence. It is not the public water-works but the private gas-works and street railways, not the post-office but the telegraph, telephones, and railroads that maintain the lobbies that infest our legislative halls.

3. *Democracy.* Public Ownership does not merely favor democracy: public ownership is democracy in industry, and democracy in industry is essential to real democracy in political life. Vast inequalities in wealth beget vast inequalities in political power. A man with nothing is not the political equal of a man with two hundred millions. Our railway monarchs, sugar kings, oil emperors, telegraph princes, telephone earls, coal magnates, beef barons, and other lords of industry and potentates of the market constitute as real an aristocracy as any that ruled in the olden time. The Federal Constitution carefully provides against titles of nobility. We are guarded against the shadow of aristocracy, but the substance of it,—the overgrown power of a few individuals, the power of a few to control for their selfish purposes the lives of many,—that we have not escaped. Public ownership and coöperative industry will do for industrial affairs what our constitutions are intended to accomplish for political affairs, and send the new aristocracy of wealth to dwell with the old aristocracy of birth.

4. *Manhood.* Public ownership aids the development of manhood by improving the conditions of labor, by increasing the interest of the people in public affairs—so leading to a deeper civic patriotism and a nobler citizenship—and most of all by changing the ideals of men and youth. The ideal of private business is profit; the ideal of public business is service. Every change from private to public ownership means a change of purpose from private profit to public service, from dividends for a few to service for all. It is a step away from the commercialism that is the great defect of our time—a step toward the coöperative ideal of a union of all for the service of all. It is a change in the relationships of men from mastery and

conflict to the far nobler relationship of partnership under the protection of which may be evolved a fuller degree of devotion, the noblest relation of all, the mutualistic relation in which each seeks the good of others from motives of sympathy and love.

It must be noted that *public ownership and government ownership are not synonymous*. Russia has government ownership of railroads, but there is no public ownership of railroads in Russia because the people do not own the government. Philadelphia has not had real public ownership of gas-works because the people do not own the councils. Where legislative power is perverted to private purposes, where the spoils system prevails and the offices are treated as private property, where government is managed in the interests of a few individuals or of a class, anything that is in the control of the government is *really* private property, although it may be *called* public property. If councils and legislatures are masters instead of the people, they are likely to use the streets and franchises for private gain instead of the public good. If the government is a private monopoly, everything in the hands of the government is a private monopoly also. At the heart of all our philosophy about the public ownership of monopolies lies the necessity for public ownership of the government. The monopoly of making and administering the law underlies all the rest. If the people are to own and operate water-works, street-railways, and other industrial monopolies, they must own and operate the government. Public ownership of the government is necessary to trustworthy public ownership of any other industry; wherefore direct legislation, civil service reform, and direct nominations by the voters (through which alone the people can thoroughly own and operate the government) must form a part of every true plan for the public ownership of monopolies.

Looking at the question historically there can be no doubt that industrial democracy—that is, public ownership and co-operative industry—will be attained. In every department of life the trend of history has been first toward concentration

and afterward toward diffusion. Organization, leadership, despotism, democracy—that has been the history of religion and politics and it will be the history of industry. Luther's Reformation was a revolt against despotism in religion, and an effort to establish liberty and democracy in religious thought and action. The grand political movement that has swept over the civilized world in our own age is the revolt against political despotism and the effort to establish political democracy. Individual aggrandizement has now taken refuge in the industrial world, and a new revolt is already in progress that must in the end establish industrial democracy and emancipate the nations from the despotism of wealth.

FRANK PARSONS.

Boston, Mass.

THE LABOR PROBLEM.

THE problems of civilization, governmentally and industrially, are those of association and freedom. The earlier forms assumed were those of governmental despotism and industrial slavery. These forms have been changed—sometimes by the gradual and almost imperceptible process of evolution, and at other times, when the natural process of evolution has been retarded by the opposition of those enjoying a monopoly of governmental or industrial position and abusing their privilege, the changes have been so sudden as to be known as governmental revolution or industrial emancipation. The founding of the American nation was a revolution to establish political equality, and our Civil War was an industrial revolution to abolish the ownership of human beings as “property.” The modern “Labor Movement” is to establish equality of economic opportunity, or to abolish the ownership of the workingman’s opportunity to work as “property;” and as it progresses it assumes an ever-increasing public importance and interest.

Recognizing this fact, Congress passed an act, approved by the President on June 18, 1898, “authorizing the appointment of a non-partizan commission to collate information and to consider and recommend legislation to meet the problems presented by labor, agriculture, and capital.” This act defined the duties of the commission specifically, “to investigate questions pertaining to immigration, to labor, to agriculture, to manufacturing, and to business, and to report to Congress and to suggest such legislation as it may deem best upon these subjects,” and also “that it shall furnish such information and suggest such laws as may be made a basis for uniform legislation by the various States of the Union, in order to harmonize conflicting interests and to be equitable to the laborer, the employer, the producer, and the consumer.” The final report of this com-

mission was submitted to Congress in February, 1902, and in discussing the causes of strikes and lockouts in this report the commission says: "The fundamental causes of labor disputes lie deep in the present organization of society. . . . So long as the classes of employers and employees exist, there will be strikes and lockouts. . . ." Those two sentences contain a key to the solution of the "Labor Problem." Observe there are two "*classes*" named, with the assertion that as long as they exist "there will be strikes and lockouts." The inevitable conclusion is that, in order to make an end to all strikes, it will be necessary to remove the cause, which is, as stated, the "present organization of society" into these two "*classes*."

Granting that the above diagnosis of the case by the commission is the true one, it is evident from a further perusal of their report that they devoted much time and space to discussion largely irrelevant. For example, in discussing the economic effects of strikes, the report says: "The most powerful indictment that can be brought against strikes is that which charges them with being economically wasteful and injurious to society." But evidently this is not an indictment against strikes at all, but an indictment of the present organization of society into "*classes*"—the *cause of strikes*. To call it an indictment against strikes is like indicting the innocent purchaser of stolen goods and letting the thief go unpunished. Or, to use another illustration, if a man discovered that the water of a well contained typhoid germs, and then used it for drinking purposes and bewailed the outbreak of fever in his family, we would almost question his sanity, to say nothing of his sagacity. What opinion, then, must we hold concerning those who, having discovered the cause of a social disease, enlarge upon the seriousness of varied aspects of the malady instead of counseling the avoidance of the cause?

The "Labor Problem," then, is: How shall the cause of strikes be removed? Let us inquire, first, what are the "conflicting interests" that the legislation specified as a duty of the industrial commission to suggest is to "harmonize?" We find the answer in this subdivision heading their report—"Profits

and Wages." Over these is the irrepressible conflict between Capital and Labor—irrepressible until Labor wins the day, or until *ownership of the opportunity to work* as well as ownership of the worker has ceased to be a means of obtaining the worker's product for his subsistence. The discussion of this subject in the commission's report is very superficial. It says: "The problem of profits and wages must be considered under two separate and wholly distinct aspects. The first question has to do with the share of the product of industry going to labor as compared with the share going to owners of capital, land, monopolies, etc." It is evident that the larger the "share" going to labor as "*wages*" the smaller will be the "share" going to monopolists as "*profits*." Consequently, when wages are a maximum, profits will be zero; or, to reward every one according to his labor means simply the abolition of "*profits*," and making all exchanges equivalent mutual services.

In order to have "free competition" it is necessary that both choice of occupation and opportunity to exchange should be open to every one. The present condition is one of almost universal monopoly. A man is free to choose his occupation, provided he can get a job in that occupation. Trade-unions attempt to combat this monopoly condition by limiting the number of persons entering a trade, whereas supply and demand and individual choice should be a natural limit to the number of persons following any occupation. In coal mining the organization of the miners has been a recent development, and we see the result of non-organization—wages fixed by the lowest possible limit of subsistence. On the other hand, owing to the monopoly of the coal fields in private ownership for profit at the expense of the general welfare, coal costs the consumer millions of dollars annually more than it would under public ownership.

There are various misapprehensions regarding the meaning of "public ownership." Those making profits out of the private monopoly of public utilities are opposed to the abolition of such monopoly, for the same reason that the owners of

chattel slaves, a half century ago, were opposed to the abolition of chattel slavery. In fact, the present stage of industrial development is described by Mr. Hadley in his "Economics" as that in which "*property has taken the place of slavery as an economic force.*" This statement is not very clear, for slaves were "property" before the abolition of slavery. The statement really signifies that *property in the opportunity to work* (which is known as capital) has taken the place of *property in the worker* (or "slavery") "as an economic force;" that is, as a means of obtaining the product of the worker's industry at an average cost of his subsistence (which was the economic advantage to be derived from chattel slavery), and at the same time avoid any financial interest in the life of the worker. It is evident, therefore, that, as a means of obtaining something for nothing, property in the opportunity to work surpasses property in the worker.

So much for the existing industrial situation. It shows clearly that what is known as "profits" or "earnings of capital," and is so designated in the industrial commission's report, are identical with what was formerly known as the "profits" of slavery or the "earnings of slave labor." To increase wages, therefore, until there are no profits is what is meant by "public ownership of public utilities." This will make the economic return to every individual exactly measured by the service that he renders, and all economic differences will then be due to differences in individual ability and taste. This is the ideal of both ethics and economics—the goal desired by every honest man (and really every man desires to be honest, though many have not learned what constitutes honesty)—the realization of the Golden Rule and the Royal Law.

The evil in the trusts consists simply in the permission of private ownership of public property, which compels people to pay for that which really by natural right belongs to them, but which by legal right belongs to some private owner of public property. We build our streets and highways, and they are free to any one who wishes to use them, the only cost after the outlay for construction being cost of maintenance; whereas

under private ownership of public property the people pay not only all cost of maintenance but in addition an excess charge called "earnings of capital." All capital should be publicly owned just as the streets and highways, as well as all public buildings, schools, parks, and in the more enlightened communities water-works, lighting plants, street railways, steam railways, telegraph and telephone lines, mines, oil, etc., are now owned.

Non-dividend-paying capital is the solution of the "Labor Problem." A government that permits the extortion of unearned "*profits*" from the producers of wealth, through the private ownership of public resources, is criminally "paternalistic" toward this specially privileged class.

We have discovered now the answer to the question with which we at first stated the "Labor Problem": How shall the cause of strikes be removed? The industrial commission traced the "cause of strikes and lockouts"—one of the manifestations of the "Labor Problem"—to "*classes*;" and we have discovered the origin of these "classes" in government "paternalism" toward one of them. Therefore, the cessation of this "paternalism" will abolish the specially privileged class, or *remove the cause of strikes*. This cessation of "paternalism" means the end of dividend-paying on account of the private ownership of public resources, and the returns of the last census show that the reward of labor will be more than doubled by such means. Moreover, the abolition of unjust methods of acquiring the products of industry will make it incumbent upon every individual to gain his living by the service he renders, and this will enormously reduce, if it does not entirely end, the "wasting" of social "substance in riotous living."

There are many problems involved in the transition from the present "paternalism" to the abolition of class privilege; but if the true end of all just government—to promote the general welfare and to establish justice—be kept constantly in mind, and, further, if the still higher ideal—"Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself"—be always present, the transition will

not be difficult. The equality of economic opportunity, which is the goal of the "Labor Movement," is simply the abolition of the monopoly of public resources in private control, or the cessation of dividends based thereon, with the law of "supply and demand" to regulate production unhampered by monopoly.

HORACE MANN.

Washington, D. C.

A SCHOOL OF CIVICS.

THIS title is not as new as it was a few years ago. The mind of communities and municipalities, as well as of large educational institutions, is growing, not accustomed to it, but ready for it. And the idea, briefly set forth, is not as formidable as it at first appears. The thought that underlies it is already quite familiar to the municipal and civic mind; namely, that a municipality is a partnership concern—a firm of citizens doing business along definite lines of activity and function. Comprehensively stated, it may be said that every property-owner (and every tenant through his landlord) is a member of the municipal firm. He pays into the general capital of the concern a certain definite *pro rata* share, levied by assessment at a certain rate and called “taxes.” In return for this contribution to the “common wealth” he receives a certain dividend in the shape of roads, schools, police and fire protection, in some cases light, water, and heat, and has removed from his premises certain undesirable elements of refuse, by way of sewerage and scavenger work.

This in broad lines is the business compact into which the citizen enters with the municipality. And this idea, “The municipality is a business concern,” is growing constantly and appreciably clearer to the municipal mind. In witness whereof certain large municipalities in the State of Ohio and two other Western States, and such solitary instances in the East as the “Revolt of East Orange” (N. J.), may be quoted. The latter is of more than passing or local interest owing to the fact that the village of East Orange is one of a number of suburban residence-towns populated up to four-fifths of its census returns by men of affairs running large and important concerns in New York City. These gentlemen have grown tired of the method in which the affairs of their village were conducted and decided upon the sentence quoted above as the

key-note of a very active and promising campaign in municipal affairs. "Run the town on business principles," just as you run your firm or your store or any business concern wherewith you are connected. And to this consciousness, community after community is waking up.

Beyond this consciousness, however, looms up another—equally interesting, equally valuable, and equally sensible in every way; and that is a School of Civics: not a school for the discussion of abstract civic problems in academic ways, but a school of civics in the same sense as a "business college." When the commercial world of America entered fully upon its career,—when the great city began to play the part it now plays in commercial life, in contradistinction to the agricultural or rural life,—and the ponderous wave of civilization began slowly to set cityward, there arose a distinct consciousness of a need. It was the need of "skilled labor;" there was a distinct demand for clerks, bookkeepers, accountants, typewriters, stenographers—all the host of helpers necessary to run a large business concern successfully. And on the crest of this demand grew the "business college," a school where men and women were trained for this special class of service, as nurses are trained at a hospital training-school and preachers in a seminary. And the business college, or the business course in a university or college, is now recognized as a legitimate channel and source of supply for the class of skilled labor required for the safe and efficient conduct of large business concerns.

Business firms to-day, not unnaturally, look to a business college for this supply of clerks, accountants, and typewriters, and also look, quite naturally, to the large trust and fidelity concerns for security—backing those employees who apply for responsible positions, or positions involving matters of trust and confidence. This may be taken as a normal development of business life. And from this acceptance there grows a second step, equally normal. Granted that a municipality is a business concern on a larger scale, it follows that a municipality has need of certain definite amounts of skilled and un-

skilled labor. It needs men to dig trenches and grade streets; it needs men to shovel coal into its furnaces, and other items of unskilled labor with which we are not concerned in this article. Besides these it needs skilled labor in the way of engineers, architects, etc., all of whom are trained in schools more or less practical and efficient. But, again, besides these, it needs skilled labor in the form of tax-assessors, tax-collectors, accountants, building inspectors, sanitary inspectors, controllers, treasurers, and all classes of officials keeping a more or less elaborate system of accounts. These have been hitherto chosen at random or by a ridiculous system called "election;" but no manner of election fits a man for the tenure of an office for which he has had no training or schooling. An ordinary business concern would not dream of choosing its bookkeepers, its skilled buyers, or its accountants by a system of popular elections. It engages such men on some ground of skill, backed either by experience previously gained or by some manner of schooling or education.

If this be true in the smaller firm, it is equally true in the larger firm called a municipality. In fact it is a matter of surprise that men of business capacity submit with utter docility to a political superstition. I know of small suburban municipalities whose chief element of inhabitants consists almost entirely of wealthy business men who manage large corporate concerns in the metropolis. This gives such a suburb a property valuation that is exceptionally large considering the territory covered. This valuable property, the adjustment of its values, the levying of taxes upon it, the method of that levying to attain the best and most effectual and lasting results — all such matters these men, with a surprising amount of negligence, have left entirely in the hands of a game of chance, called "election," simply because the thing called an "election" in the political arena, and based entirely upon certain readily understandable civic superstitions, resembles somewhat the method pursued in various organizations called by a similar name. But an election of officers in a corporation, in a club, in a lodge, in a fraternity, is an

election of *members* of that organization, and not of chance parties dependent upon colonized votes. Does this statement attack the franchise? Not by any means—it attacks a superstition concerning a franchise, but it attacks no valid principle of civics.

The class of men spoken of above, as I said, submit with astonishing docility to the impositions of a game of chance. This is the more astonishing when it is noted that in a villageful of such business men there is a heavy percentage of persons each one of whom daily manages a business concern involving values very similar and sometimes quite equal to those representing the entire taxable valuation of the village of which he is a resident. He does this with comparative ease and as a matter of daily routine. It is therefore a safe deduction that any one of these men could run the affairs of the entire village without great difficulty. But he has not the time or the inclination to do so. Admitted he has not the time or inclination to do many items in the large business concern he runs in the city, what is his line of action? He hires competent men to run his advertising, to become heads of departments, etc. He does not "elect" them, and he wants them trained. Why not do the same for the village? Why should not a city council be virtually a board of directors, which employs its assessors, its collectors, its treasurer, etc., in exactly the same way as any other corporate body does, and which pays men fair wages for competent service?

But competent service—how obtain it? In exactly the same way that we obtain competent service in ordinary business. We have the business college and the commercial school: why not have the Civic School, and educate tax assessors, city officials, city accountants, city clerks? It is exceedingly unfair both to John Smith and to the community to elect John Smith with a great hurrah of ballots and fireworks to be tax assessor and then drop him into the chaotic mess of Topsy growth that is now considered the "Assessor's Book," in which previous assessors guessed at five-eighths of the value of this piece of property, "soaked" a non-resident on general principles,

and raised the valuation of a woman's property because she would be afraid to climb up the stairs and fight her way through the tobacco-smoke in the room where the Board of Appeals meets, and because she "haint got no vote nohow." It is exceedingly unfair to drop a newly-elected assessor into this mess, ask him to face a problematic system of taxation, tell him to go to the county seat and perjure himself on his Bible oath that he has "assessed all property at its full value," when he knows, and everybody else knows, he has not. These things are either superstition or they are knavery, and I prefer the longer word. But they are horribly unfair.

Take the matter in hand. Ask the colleges to add to their training of doctors and clergymen and lawyers and engineers the training of tax assessors, of municipal accountants, of city officials—and then *hire* the officials. And establish schools that will teach municipal arithmetic, municipal bookkeeping, municipal bonding, and things of that sort, and let the student qualify, give him his diploma, and let him face civil-service examinations. Then put him in the market and he will have no difficulty in selling his services at a fair wage to one or more municipalities.

Why should not four or six small municipalities club together, pay a man who has studied land values, has made a specialty of the insurance and real-estate business, who would be hired by any insurance company as an appraiser at a good salary, and do away with the tax-assessor by election? If an insurance company finds that it stands to reason that it engages the services of a competent man as appraiser, will it not stand equally to reason that a municipality should do the same thing for the performance of similar work?

A Civic School to educate municipal officials is as legitimate an enterprise as a business college that trains and educates bookkeepers and accountants for individual business houses.

ADOLPH ROEDER.

Orange, N. J.

PSYCHOLOGY AND CRIME.

NEW truths are rare gems. If one were born each century we would be richer and better than now. But next to the discovery of a new truth is the new application of an old truth to fit the knowledge and needs of a living age. This was done in the century just closed in the new application of psychology to the practical affairs of life. The mastery of mind in the abstract was a fitting task for the giant philosophers of the scholastic period. But the child-psychology of a Froebel, or the physiologic psychology of a James, is more acceptable to a generation of living, feeling, moving beings. From the consideration of psychical entities as factors in purely speculative philosophy to the study of an actual brain as the instrument for the expression of real life is a far cry; but it is a welcome one to this practical, acting age. Thereby the chasm has been bridged between two divergent lines of philosophy. Each was trying to disengage the physical from the mental. One was lost in the mysticism of possible mental states, independent of the body; the other, conceiving the body as an ideal chemical laboratory, tried to interpret all its phenomena in terms mechanical. Each was as empirical and impossible as the other. Then it was, when these two tendencies were about "gone to seed," that great discoveries were disclosed in the domain of human life. Upon the one hand the physicists were rapidly learning (not a few reluctantly admitting) that the body is not a dead crucible, but a living organism. It contains a marvelous factor called "vitality," with which they must ever reckon as of greater potency than any medicine or food. On the other hand, the moment the psychologists extended their study of the laws of thought to the brain, the instrument of all known mentation, they found that the paths of thought are almost as endless as their former speculations had been. They learned that gray matter, identical with that of the brain, extends into the

spinal column, and that all our nerve processes are thought-expressions.

With these two discoveries before us, then, we can understand that no physical ailment can be intelligently considered or treated without a proper recognition of the power of mind over matter. Nor will the disordered brain be expected to return to perfect and permanent sanity while there is an enfeebled and abnormal physical condition. But the intimate relation and interdependence of mind and body, here touched upon, is only a part of and preliminary to a yet greater discovery. It seems to be true that great inventions and discoveries are apt to be simultaneous. So sociology came to the world contemporaneously with many other strides of science, to teach us that, as no one science can be studied well without knowing its relation to all other sciences, so the individual man should not be considered independently of his relation to humanity. His body is either a menace or a contributor to the civic health. As a hermit, he may be a healthy animal. Not so the mind; for man is a social being. In isolation he loses his mind and becomes a maniac. The normal mind must strike its roots into both the physical and social soil. No less a scientist than George Henry Lewes claims to be the first writer to formulate this thought. At any rate, it is this double dependence of the mind that lends significance to the subject of this essay. It is this that makes crime not a matter of physical heredity merely, but one of social responsibility as well.

As there are no "born" consumptives, so there are no "born" criminals. It is with but a tendency to either that any mortal can be endowed. But, as we try to eliminate the consumptive diathesis, so may we lessen the tendency to crime. We were none of us consulted as to how or where we should be born. And, unfortunately, those who have the most unfavorable birthright have also the least to say as to what their environment shall be. Let us not, therefore, soothe our consciences by laying belated blame or posthumous pity at the door of our ancestors. To be sure, a responsible being should be held accountable in great measure if he has not overcome the evil

tendencies of his nature, or if he has not become master of his environment. But meantime shall we forget the responsibility of those who gave him more than a fair heritage of evil tendencies? Shall we shirk the present social responsibility for the evil institutions that make his self-mastery doubly difficult?

It is not, however, the object of this article to point a moral, so much as to relate some of the results of several years' experience in dealing at first hand with those who have been in prison. As superintendent of the Central Howard Association, of Chicago, engaged in securing employment for and otherwise aiding ex-prisoners, the writer has had ample opportunity to note the pathologic attitude of the ex-prisoner toward society. That this attitude must be spoken of as pathologic, is not, however, as I have already intimated, wholly the fault of the individual. If society had sooner recognized to what extent the problem of criminology is a psychologic one, the anti-social symptoms would now be far less marked. Because of the false and unthinking attitude of society toward the prisoner he becomes the victim of a bad line of suggestion that helps to weaken his will and break down his manhood.

But first let us pause to observe how the thought-force of others, adversely applied, contributes to the causes of crime. Here is a gathering of women in a sewing circle or missionary tea. They are talking about Tom, the son of a woman who is not present. They tell how bad he is getting. They say he drinks. "What a shame! So young, too!" The prophetess speaks: "He'll go wrong yet; you see if he doesn't." Science and sympathy are combined in the final utterance: "Oh, well, he can't help it, poor fellow—it's born in him." The women separate, but not so the psychic coterie of condemnation they have centered upon the unfortunate head of Tom. Does any one believe he does not feel its influence? He grows more reckless and proceeds to do what they have thought and spoken him into doing. Finally, in a daring spree he commits a crime. The wise wag their heads and say, "I told you so." He goes to jail, and the populace peer through the bars at him as if he

had suddenly become a thing apart—something other than a man. He knows he has a thousand good impulses to the one bad one expressed, but no one believes it. All act as if they expected him henceforth to be a human monster. He is sent to the penitentiary and branded as a "criminal." His personality is exchanged for a number. His keepers, it may be with little knowledge of human nature and less character, proceed to crush his self-assertion, and with it his self-respect. They tell him at the end of his term (not to analyze the interim) that he will surely be back in three months, or in six at the most. This lack of confidence begets lack of confidence in himself. Still he goes out with a new-born purpose. But will the infant survive the look askance, and the inexorable but ignorant pronouncement—"Once a criminal, always a criminal?" Though he have a will of iron, can it combat the combined psychic suggestion of a whole prejudiced community? The man's position at this critical time is well described in the following words of one who speaks from experience:

"The man comes out, after serving a few years, with his habits of observation lost. He is secretive, non-communicative, with no confidence in himself and little in others. He has lost the art of expressing himself properly, or timely, even in ordinary conversation. He hesitates and is nervous and embarrassed from self-consciousness of his deficiencies. He loses opportunities of securing employment through his inability to place the subject in hand in the right words at the right moment. His powers of observation and interest in his surroundings have been so long curbed by fear that they have become dormant, and his chances for employment and advancement are in consequence so much less that they soon become apparent to him and embitter him against the world in general."

The question now is, How far can this situation be changed by a specific line of suggestive treatment? To what extent can the negative influences be counteracted by positive, reassuring, and uplifting ones? If suggestive therapeutics is of value in the treatment of the physical invalid, will not suggesto-therapy have a still more direct effect in the restoration of this psychical invalid? As a matter of fact, we find it a practical and powerful

means of restoration. Here is a man who has paid the penalty of his crime, and faces the world with a better purpose. That better purpose is the saving factor in his life. But everything depends upon his being surrounded by people and influences that will nourish and foster and cherish that impulse until it becomes the dominating purpose of his life. This is done in the work of the Central Howard Association by putting him into normal environment and surrounding him with healthful influences. Employment is secured with the knowledge of the employer, and the man enters upon his new opportunity with his head up and a light heart. The positive is always stronger than the negative, and faith begets faith. Is it wonderful, therefore, that by multiplying favorable conditions marvelous results are accomplished? Of the men assisted during the last few years with this method always in mind, fully ninety per cent. have been permanently and effectually helped to good citizenship. To be sure, the majority of these have been what would be called "accidental criminals," with little or no hereditary taint or tendency. But I am persuaded that the law of suggestion, as a post-prison force, if applied persistently, and perhaps under relaxed conditions, will largely overcome both hereditary tendencies and a long period of vicious environment. (I use *hereditary* as it is generally understood, as a fatalism that marks the man beyond redemption; and I mean that *environment* which, though it demoralizes and embitters, yet cannot deprive the man of the Divine image, which may be discovered and asserted.) The difference between the accidental and the habitual criminal is, after all, only a matter of time. The initial and producing causes in each were the same. The accidental criminal is the acute invalid, who most likely came to his estate through some neurasthenic impulse. The habitual offender is the chronic invalid. But if we go back far enough we shall find the neurasthenic impulse that started his anti-social career. Vicious prison systems and the irrational attitude of society did the rest.

But far more can be accomplished in the opposite direction by strong, reassuring, healthful influences. Suggesto-therapy,

as applied in this direction, must, of course, be positive and uplifting. It must reinspire courage and confidence in the subject. It must tend to replace baneful habits of life, thought, and sensation with wholesome ones. It must direct an otherwise aimless life, if necessary, in a normal direction, and fill it with a purpose nobler than it has ever known.

The problem of the criminal is an *industrial* as well as a *psychologic* problem. Not only should the prisoner have the right kind of work, but the first essential after his release is the opportunity to earn an honest living. "The first civilizing influence," says President Eliot, "is steady work. The next is culture and refinement." This last need brings to our thought the *educational* aspect of the problem. It would be trite to say that ignorance and crime are as brother and sister. Many would say that the question is primarily a *religious* one; and while the most effectual element in the reformation of a criminal will doubtless always be in instilling in him a definite religious impulse, yet that impulse must be applied to all the practical affairs and temptations of life. It is this fact that makes the problem so largely a *temperance* one. By far the largest number of crimes may be traced directly or indirectly to intemperance. Then there is the *legislative* phase of the problem, involved in unequal sentences for the same crime, and indefinite sentence without considering the degree of real culpability. Altogether, the question readily assumes the proportions of a great *race* problem, which cannot be solved by any one panacea, nor yet by aiding this or that class or condition or color alone, but by the uplift of the race as a whole.

FRANK EMORY LYON.

Chicago, Ill.

AGRARIAN REVIVAL.

AS to the future peace of this country there are more pessimists than optimists, and the latter are measurable by their prosperity. The concentration of nearly half our people in towns of over ten thousand results in poverty, despair, vice, and crime. From harsh competition in the cities the tide of insolence and profanity is rising, hardness of heart is increasing, altruism has become obsolete, and egoism is up to date. Some of the proletariat, while rightfully forming unions to protect themselves from oppression, have gone to proscription, intolerance, and brutality. When they stick themselves to a customer by appointment or contract they charge by the hands on the clock, not for service rendered. For slob work they make up in bluff; for laziness, high prices fill the gap; broken contracts they meet by court perjury. Their opposition to the militia is with insurrectionary intent.

People of comely apparel and passable manners will cheat a car conductor, and young business men will sit for miles in a street-car while fragile women stand—a disgusting exhibition that, in itself, augurs national downfall. The learned professions are mercenary, gradually losing public confidence. Right amid evidences of thrift—theaters, parades, fairs, promenades of fashion, and crowded department stores—there are daily and hourly tragedies. The ninety per cent. of business failures, the craze for public office, the haggard men, the immured and cultured women without patrimony or hope, the thousand tricks for a livelihood, the morbid and *outré* public sensualism, the prostitution of the public bill-boards, the widespread violation of city ordinances, the adulteration of food, drink, and drugs almost without hindrance, a street-car service worthy of barbarism—all these prove that the city candle that consumes the country moth is not all allurements.

It is not a good answer that when the nation is in a tight

place the heart of the people is all right, or that an army quickly springs from the soil. The heart of the people may be too slow, and that army would be picked up only from the martial spirits here and there who love fight. But let that element be skimmed off and the rest of the nation would get down on their knees and buy security with their money. There is in the country, too, of course, now and then a case of morbid vice or crime; but they are all known, while in the cities their under-current is estimated by the continuous flow of the criminal courts like the Mississippi River. Henry Ward Beecher said, "Life in the city is a chronic violation of nine-tenths of all that is natural to man;" and the trite quotation of Jefferson is a truth for all time, "Cities are festering sores upon the body politic." Not until every individual is self-supporting, or until there is a natural balance between town and country, can there be a normal life or will society be out of danger.

If we fail to feed an animal it will steal; it is so with human nature. But organized and private charities, subsidized colleges and churches, protective tariffs, etc., are only brushing back the sea with a broom, or raising river levees against the inundation sure to come upon thriving towns and fair territories. Although in the cities the majority are comfortably employed and enjoy life, yet it is with a strain, almost a fight, and there are always more hands than work, more mouths than food. Only the average city person knows the crushed feeling of being "sacked." Then one is face to face with eternity. Where one commits suicide a thousand think it. But the countryman has an easy feeling that while he is resting the ground is doing his work; that cannot burn up nor be stolen. There is no love or fidelity like that of Mother Earth. This ever-cankering, wearying, and oppressive sense of insecurity in city life will soon be changed by a pell-mell rush for a bit of land. There is no insurance like it.

The "man with the hoe" is a European clod-hopper; in America he reads the newspapers and becomes President, judge, general, admiral, senator, political "boss." The country grows these men. There is not a leader in America, except

as to money-making, whose character was not cast in the country. Country people have not that high strain of city pleasure by the pace that kills, but they have a negative and steady happiness that comes from simple, natural, and unperverted life in the absence of inflicted misery. The soil and forests bring out the natural humors of the soul. Moreover, it is the only business hard-pan, the only occupation where there are no bankrupts; and the further we get from it the more we get into mischief. There is nothing like a hoe to take the twist out of a city man's brain. When the city poor shall cower in a fireless room the poor farmer can sit before his back log and crack nuts or read "Robinson Crusoe." He may loll and muse in the summer shade while the distant murmurs of city famine, tumult, or riot fall upon his ear with only feeble curiosity. The coming labor war will not reach him, and will concern him no more than the swarming of a neighboring hive of bees. On the farms there are no lockouts, no strikes, no anarchy.

The writer of this passed his earlier life where the farms were all-containing, where we made our own clothing all the way from the sheep's back or the field of flax. We were ambitious in a small way, healthy, patriotic, peaceable, law-abiding, and sank upon our pillows with a gentle sigh of comfort and content when we heard the howling blizzard or the rain upon the roof. We knew nothing of the vaudeville, the passing regiment, the grand opera, or the millionaires; but we had ready food and shelter, husking bees, paring bees, raising bees, spelling bees, lyceum lectures, and sleigh rides to the jingling bells through tonic air and over white, spotless creation. But an old copper cent was as big as a cart wheel. Sometimes we caught a wondering glimpse of the passing creatures of fashion, but we had no covetousness nor envy. Making the morning fire gave us daily energy and appetite; there were no night furnaces to soften the lungs for pneumonia. Some of us were ignorant of hygiene and so died of fever, but that was our own fault, not the farm's. The most thrifty kept upon their bureau a Bible and a box of pills. We raised produce and traded it at the neighboring store for all the works of art and

mechanism we needed. The poorest had what the richest in the city cannot buy—fresh spring water, pure air, fresh vegetables, and, above all, limitless scope of action undwarfed by right-angled paths over stone and iron. For the roar of cities we had the song of birds, the sough of fragrant trees, and that never-ending variety of landscape that the city man loves so well as to pay big money for it upon the painter's easel.

But we also had some sins, particularly those of narrowness, ignorance, superstition, and discontent. Education would mollify this. As kindly and noble as Carnegie is, his library benefactions have been somewhat misplaced. They have a tendency to increase centralization, which is the curse of the age, and to overeducate people away from the practical, simple, and earnest courses of life. He should have deposited with every fourth-class postmaster in the land plain libraries of the physical sciences, hygiene, and moral reform, and with his remaining millions bought and equipped small farms for the city poor. It is too early in the history of man for universal high education.

In the country within a few hours' ride of New York City, and in the old States, there is to-day a great population who live well and enjoy life, yet never see a hundred dollars cash a year—nay, not fifty; for their natural system of small barter is widespread, confirmed, and effective. They do not compete with machine farming for the general market; they are always safe, at least, and as happy and contented as their moral education will permit. It is amazing to the city man how little cash these fine middle-class American families can get along on and be happy. Thank God that farming is not intended as a business, for money-making in general, but is for simple support. "In the sweat of thy brow shalt thou eat bread."

A discontented young farmer, with calf-skin boots and stand-up collar, standing upon a railroad platform, said he could go to the city, hire out as a day-laborer, earn more money, and enjoy life better than on a farm where he had been all his life. He was totally false and mistaken; he had never been a laborer in a city; he was a disgruntled exception. The trouble was in

his soul, not in the soil. He had worked too hard; he wanted too much. It would have been right for him to go to the city; he would not have needed to fill the place of only a day-laborer. It would have been right also for a city pauper or criminal to take his place. An immigrant said in an anarchistic assemblage he would rather starve in the city than work in the country, and near him a woman screeched, "That factory [pointing out of the window] ought to burn down to give our men something to do in rebuilding it and the machinery!"

A people that has bread riots and pays hundreds of millions of dollars annually for charities and police, in the presence of as much land as we have, knows as much about the science of government and social philosophy as monkeys who shiver about expiring fires and adjacent wood piles left by the surveyors. The writer has visited the so-called worn-out farms of the East and found upon all of them spontaneous growths of timber at various heights, exactly marking the several dates of desertion. The owners abandoned those farms because they were enterprising and could do better elsewhere. But those lands were good as an alternative to the poor-house. Pulverization and irrigation work magical results. Land cannot be "worn out" with intelligent treatment any more than the sunshine and rains can be worn out. Land about the capitals of Europe has been tilled for a thousand years. In saying this it is with a full personal experience of the soul-wearying tillage of impoverished land; but it is not so sterile as a city garret, basement, or pavement. The scientific farming of Cornell University has produced 400 bushels of potatoes to an acre as against 60 from farms in the same county.

People born and raised in the city give scarcely more than a childish consideration to their source of food. Each instinctively imagines that daily manna is provided miraculously, and that his own vocation underlies all others. This is illustrated by the present coal famine. The farmer burns wood and practises all trades. But we have segregated our industry and thus become dependent. The coal miners, having cornered that business and successfully browbeaten the State of

Pennsylvania and even the United States into a compromise against law and sovereign dignity, will try it again. Then the railroad employees will strike and some of them will derail the cars and lay it to sympathizers and the police. Lastly the capitalists will try a turn about—and strike. Then business will cease, money will stop circulation, and we shall have a tribulation. In that day the farmer will be the envied one. The politicians of one State will not agree with the politicians of another State; lawyers will give the Executives different advice about their powers, and then hunger will know no delay or law. Then will come the mob whose numbers and frenzy will do its havoc in a night of flame and terror, brushing away the nerveless militia and half-sympathizing police like dust from a butterfly's wing. The Roman sports, the French Revolution, and the American lynchings show what human nature can do. By rebuilding upon the blackened *débris* they who said they would rather starve in the city than work in the country will boast that they have made themselves a job.

The executive branches of our American polity are feeble; there is personal responsibility, and men want to run "again." We are suffering for want of law and want of administration of the law. Senator Hill's coal plank was right; we shall come to it at last. We are now one people, not a jealous lot of colonies. Steam has given us one body and electricity has made us one soul. So we need *one law*. This parley by government with lawbreakers is another proof of our lingering superstitious sentiment for the archaic crust and cradle of the Constitution—a boy's suit of clothes that does not fit the man. Commercial division of pursuits, leaving people mutually dependent for the necessities of life, will demand more positive law than the "comity between the States," or arbitration. Our loose-jointed Union cannot to-day defend its people from the commonest assailants. The head of the nation may be wantonly murdered, yet any witness thereto may simply cross a stream, or an imaginary line, right within our own boundaries, and defeat public justice. We must scatter our disturbing elements into the country, where they cannot combine for harm.

and will gradually imbibe public virtue. Magazine explosives lie quiet, cool, and harmless until a spark touches their latent power. By comparison we may have a care of the equally dangerous explosives that leer at us from the highways and byways and that are seething in Sunday clubs and rum-holes. What widespread woe may result from the torch or pistol of one!

The gruesome whine in the cities, "There ain't no business," is answerable that there is *too much* business for the customers. There is always business enough upon the soil, not immediately for any individual, but there can be for all after the endowment of a policy of agriculture by the Government. There is good land everywhere, even with its rest every seventh year. Within the city limits of New York are virgin soil and primeval forests; and within four hours' ride of the city is land enough to support the city. During our period of nation-forming, when we called ourselves an agricultural people, only one-tenth of our population was in the large towns. Then Tocqueville said there was not a beggar in all America. Blessed are we who can look back upon those times of plenty and peace. All had leisure for enjoyment, and there was no pulling of others under the water to save ourselves.

We should start into this agrarian revival with the simple idea that the city poor are not to be sent upon the farms to be lifted into business thrift or luxury, but rather for mere self-support, to escape the poor-house, the prison, or the end of the dock. A practical plan for this change might be this: The benevolent rich could coöperate with the Federal Government in organizing a bureau for the distribution of small farms. There is hardly a farmer in the United States who would not for ready cash sell a few acres with shanty, tools, seed, and his own instruction thrown in. He would then always have his resident harvester—a very important problem not heretofore solved. This bureau should have its bank account, its committee, its president, secretary, buyers, instructors, and law and medical departments. In fact it should be almost a State organization. It should have its storehouses of seed, implements,

ready-made cottages, and subsistence. There should not be anything like colonization; that would be fatal to the plan. *The beneficiaries of the new homes should be individually mingled among the healthy civic people and conditions of our country, and imbibe the examples of industry, economy, temperance, and frugality.*

To these migrators no cash should ever be given; they should be escorted to their respective destinations, supplied with everything for a year under a kindly guardianship, told that they must live by their own exertions, temperance, and frugality, and that after an approved probation of five years they can have a fee-simple gift of the farm. The district resident inspectors should, by their example and precept, promote sociability, cheer, and encouragement. Township baths, lyceums, and libraries could be easily maintained that would dispel the usual loneliness and monotony. From five to ten acres to a family would be sufficient. The Hon. Joseph Arch, called the "farmer member" of the British House of Commons, says three acres are enough for a family, and that the tide should be turned back from the city to the country. This plan need not result in stagnation and a limit to ambition. Occasionally boys or girls would grow up whose genius and energy would lead them to the city, where room would be made by some ne'er-do-wells who would take their places in the country, and thus a natural circulation, like the currents in the ocean, be kept up. Our rich people are ready with many millions to place it where it will do the most good. They have aggregated a hundred millions of dollars of gifts in a single year to churches, colleges, libraries, that so far as practically and finally relieving distress is unobservable. It has been like trying to fill up a rat-hole with rum.

A statement has recently appeared in the newspapers that 35,000 families in the United States own thirty-one billions of dollars. Now, if on some fine day they should finally wake up to the law that a rich man cannot enter the kingdom of heaven they might give enough money to this agricultural revival, after retaining for themselves a principal the interest

of which would provide them with idleness and luxuries all their lives, entailing the principal to their heirs, to *buy farms of forty acres each, stock, seed, and equip them for a year for six millions of families!* How easily this could be done, and what a relief to labor competition among those of skill and industry who should be fit to remain in cities! If some multi-millionaire could head a movement like this and devote his life to it he would not only die happy but he would do his country a practical service and leave a fame and monument to himself as great as George Washington's.

Such a plan as this would solve also the black problem of the South by segregating the races. The United States owes it to the South, upon whom it has turned loose, with liberty and license, the slaves, by a forced emancipation.

The pendulum of society has swung its full length toward the centers of population and will soon begin, by individual impulse, to swing back to the country. The soil is a veritable placer-mine; it responds wonderfully to care. If our only recourse for food were by some elaborate chemical process by scientific magicians, the miracle of raising food out of the ground would outmarvel the famed vegetable growth of the East Indian fakirs. Rural life has its inspiration of philosophy, poetry, and religion. All know that much Christian church-going of the cities has, by the fierce competition of business, an insincere tint. It is often said that no man can be a true Christian and do a successful business. Wealth culture, religion, and sympathy in the city become more or less hardened by a constant view of surrounding ingratitude, suffering, and sin. It is not claimed that rural occupation is the highest stimulant of art, enjoyment, or what is called social form, but it has not that cankering care of the city laborer whose pay goes for so little and who is, by driving exactions, exhausted and laid off before maturity. Agriculture was the first and will be the last occupation of man. All between those two points is artificial and uncertain. It embraces all sciences and arts; it makes the surest returns, though simple and natural. The loam of the earth is God's own bank of deposit and accommo-

dation. To the well-balanced man the highest consolation of life is personal independence, and that comes only through acres. To live in a city one must have a humble disposition or very strong nerves. But there comes a time when the strongest wants rest and the bravest wants peace. The farmer has both.

The above is simple and natural concrete fact. Intelligent alien observers residing among us and many of our own people declare we are sleeping over a volcano. Every succeeding public excitement is a harrowing one, and every hourly newspaper edition with startling headlines is of something ominous. A single morning number of a "yellow journal" contained forty-one accounts, largely displayed, of crimes and other calamities. The public appetite grows by what it feeds on. But each Thanksgiving day the prosperous assemble in their churches and feel good over their bank deposits and turkey-to-come. How do you account, O throngs of Zion, for your special divine favors, when seven thousand of your countrymen and countrywomen each year kill themselves from discouragement and want? Your giving of alms and prayers has not arrested the disease. Seek the remedy and prove that you understand true religion and civil government.

If the President of the United States were to seize upon a solution like this, and by a grand commission inaugurate a new agricultural era, he would rank throughout time with Lycurgus, Solon, Napoleon, and Marshall.

WILLIAM HEMSTREET.

Brooklyn, N. Y.

ELIZABETH CADY STANTON.

[*November 12, 1815—October 26, 1902.*]

SELDOM has it been granted to a human being to be the foremost representative of an impulse that has modified conditions throughout the civilized world, but this we may claim for Elizabeth Cady Stanton. Mrs. Stanton did not originate the "woman's rights" movement. This had been growing from the dawn of history just as fast as the exigencies and limitations of social evolution would permit. The creative mandate had been the leaven in the human lump working toward the recognition of the inherent equality of the sexes, the two halves of the generic man, made in the image of God, and set to work out his divine inheritance of dominion.

Mrs. Stanton was not the first woman to see that the right of suffrage was needed to secure and protect all other rights. Here and there throughout the ages prophetic souls had made a kindred claim, and in modern times our own land had had Abigail Adams and others of the foremothers of this Republic urging that the principles that "Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed" and "Taxation without representation is tyranny" should be adopted as our basis of national independence and should be applied to women. Margaret Fuller had demanded all that has ever been asked by anybody—absolute equality for women. The seed thoughts of such far-seeing patriots took root and blossomed into the woman suffrage movement as we know it. The age and the conditions were ready for one who should be endowed with the necessary gifts for leadership.

In Mrs. Stanton the "woman movement" took the definite form of specific and organized demands. Her happy circumstances, her forceful and charming personality, her undaunted courage and suavity, her keen logic tempered with a merry

heart and a quick wit, won for woman's cause the ear of the world. She was ably supplemented by a host of other great souls who suddenly sprang up not only here but in England. Perhaps—who knows?—they may have been the reincarnation of the Immortals who have stood for Liberty and fought its battles in ages past. We can fancy that they may have held a conclave on the shining shore and decided that the reason the freedom of the race had not been won by the blood that had been shed for it since Time began was because the blow had not been struck at the root of tyranny, which, fastening round the heart of the mother and holding close her life, made her bring forth new generations of slaves, with new fetters as firmly fixed as those that had been stricken off the generations before. "We must free women," they cry; "and only as women can we do it!" And so there were born Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Susan B. Anthony, Lucy Stone, and Matilda Joslyn Gage; and in England Mrs. John Stuart Mill, John Bright's sisters, Mrs. Wolstonholme-Elmy, and a multitude of noble souls on both sides of the sea who set flying the banner of "Equality before the law," which stands for woman's educational, industrial, professional, legal, and political rights.

Anglo-Saxon civilization sets the pace for the world, so that there has been an almost equally marked advance in the condition of woman in all nations; and it is not too much to claim that the condition of all women has been modified, improved, or given a new trend because of the movement of which Mrs. Stanton was the embodied will and purpose.

The story of Mrs. Stanton's life and work is familiar to the public, or may be learned from her autobiography, "Eighty Years and More," which Mr. Moncure D. Conway has styled "one of the four books that contain the noblest chapter of American history." I shall, therefore, only record some personal recollections, showing her as she appeared to one of her "suffrage daughters," as she loved to call the young women who rallied round her in the eighties.

I saw her first on the train, and was much struck with the conscious dignity and self-possession that every movement

showed as, during a period of waiting, she paced up and down the car. It was so unusual a proceeding in those days for a woman to infringe on the monopoly of air and exercise enjoyed by the male traveler that it made an impression on me. We went our separate ways and she never knew that in that simple act she had taught a lesson of self-respect.

My first word with her was a welcome to the Western town where, as a member of the lecture committee, I had been instrumental in securing her to give her famous lecture, "Our Girls." There was some delay in the arrival of the gentleman who was to introduce her to her audience, and she said to me, "You will introduce me, of course." I was much astonished that she could be satisfied to be presented by a woman, and it seemed hardly to show her proper respect. However, her tone and manner convinced me of her sincerity and gave me the courage to obey. We are so accustomed now to women presiding that it is hard to conceive what a step this was at that time. It identified me in the public thought with the woman suffrage movement, and it was in reality a crossing of the Rubicon for me. In this way and in the multitude of ways that her rare faculty of reading human nature suggested, she made friends and converted friends into adherents.

Mrs. Stanton was an ideal guest, entering with spirit into all that interested others. Her sympathetic approachableness led me to open my heart to her on many questions that I had pondered. She had the attitude of caring that every individual should think and think rightly. Her motherly wisdom, her genial humor, and her freedom from fussiness and arrogance made her extremely fascinating, while her personal beauty seemed to shed radiance over her argument. Her attitude was that of one who felt that everything she knew was for all who would receive it. Indeed, this sense of obligation to the world at large was the key-note of her character and what she was always trying to enkindle in others. All over the land she thus went, leaving everywhere a stimulus to higher achievement and a broader outlook.

It was extremely felicitous for the woman's rights move-

ment, at a time when by press and pulpit it was denounced as all that was unholy and especially intended as a subversion of all woman's duties as wife and mother, that its head was so marked an example of the domestic virtues. Then there were no magazines devoted to home science. Sanitation and other modern helps to hygiene had not when she was a young mother been reduced to rules, so she had to think everything out for herself. "The puzzling questions of theology and the causes of poverty," she says, "now gave place to the practical one, 'What to do with a baby?'" Having directed all the powers of her mind to this subject, the conclusions she came to could not be shaken by protests of physicians, nurses, or fond friends. An instance showing the method with which her household was governed was related to me by herself and is not found in her reminiscences. Her baby was trained to sleep by the clock, and during his slumber no soul might enter the room. A carpenter, having neglected to make some repairs in the bedroom at the designated time, came when the baby was asleep and was informed that he could not enter. He testily inquired when he could do the work, and Mrs. Stanton took out her watch and told him when the baby would be awake.

How well her wisdom served her family may be judged from the fact that all her seven children came to a strong and vigorous maturity. The knowledge gained by experience she sought to impart to others, not only on the lecture platform but on all occasions where it was possible. Especially was this the case when she saw children suffering through the ignorance of the mother. A crying baby was always an appeal to her for help. She soon had it in her arms, and, by giving it a drink, loosening its clothes, or changing its position, invariably quieted it. How thoroughly unconventional and natural she was in all this may be judged from the following incident:

On a hot day Mrs. Stanton entered a crowded car and took the only vacant seat beside a gentleman who almost immediately said: "Mother, do you know anything about babies?" She replied that this was a department of knowledge that she particularly prided herself upon. The gentleman then asked her

what could be the matter with a child on the train who had cried most of the time for the preceding twenty-four hours. Mrs. Stanton, of course, knew nothing about this particular case, so she promptly suggested her favorite prescription—a bath. To her surprise the gentleman said if she would give the bath he would provide the necessary means. He forthwith produced an india-rubber bowl, a towel, and a sponge. Mrs. Stanton, easily gaining the tired mother's consent, gave the baby a drink and a bath. The child enjoyed the treatment and was sound asleep before it could be dressed, and Mrs. Stanton left it thus when two hours later she arrived at the point where she was to lecture.

A young man who got off at the same station accosted her and begged her to go and see *his* baby, which he said had cried almost continuously since it was born, and the doctors could not tell what was the matter with it. Mrs. Stanton went home with the father and soon discovered that the difficulty was tight bandaging, according to the instructions of an ignorant nurse. She remained a long time with the parents, telling them everything she could think of about clothes, diet, and pure air. The next day, after she had reached another town, it occurred to her that she had said nothing about giving the baby water; so she telegraphed back: "Give the baby water six times a day." Her message probably was carried into many homes, for the father was a telegrapher, and for years his fellow-operators along the line would occasionally call him up and say, "Give the baby water six times a day."

Mrs. Stanton was a constant contributor to the *Woman's Tribune*, and her "Reminiscences" and "Woman's Bible" were first published in its columns. The latter brought her much blame, but it was because her motive was misunderstood; and for lack of coöperation she was not able to carry out her original plan. This was grand in conception, and some day it will be accomplished and receive the plaudits of those who preached against Mrs. Stanton's book, as did a noted Chicago minister who in his pulpit denounced it as the work of the devil.

At the inception of the undertaking her plan was thus outlined in a letter to me: "If we could get every woman to speak from her standpoint, what a grand tribute it would be to the intelligence, the thoughtfulness, the independence of our sex! Our book would then be comments from the surface, the plain English, the spiritual, the symbolical, the evangelical, the liberal, the Protestant, the Catholic, the Jew, the Gentile—all from their various standpoints. It would be a lesson to all men of toleration and wisdom such as has never before been possible."

Some prominent evangelical women, after giving her their names for the revising committee, withdrew, and this immediately brought discredit upon the undertaking in church circles. This was a great disappointment to Mrs. Stanton, as was also the fact that no Greek and Hebrew scholars could be found among women willing to assist in securing an unbiased translation. It was a larger work than at first seemed, for to find out exactly in what regard the Scriptures hold the feminine it would be necessary to consider far more than those parts directly referring to women. For instance, the word *Elohim*, a feminine plural, and many others, have been translated in the masculine gender, thus building up the whole system of our theology on the conception of a male Deity. Mrs. Stanton was aging, her sight was failing, and she could not wait for laggards; so with some help from others on the committee she put out the "Woman's Bible" in two parts, of which not one word has ever been criticized, so far as I know, save the title and her presumption for undertaking such a work. Her regret at the lack of coöperation was thus pathetically expressed in a later letter: "I thought the moral effect of a committee of women to revise the Scriptures, sitting in council two or three years, would be very good. But I could not get a committee of leading English and American women. For me to do it as an individual would not have the same effect in dignity."

Mrs. Stanton chose the title because of its brevity, and, in view of the storm of criticism that this brought about her head, it is interesting to note that there has recently been issued by

a leading publishing house a "Children's Bible," with indorsements by doctors of divinity and a bishop, who tells us that "not all of the Bible is of equal worth or pertinency." All passages teaching the subjection of women are omitted, thus answering to the demand that Mrs. Stanton very recently made for an expurgated edition of the Bible for children's use. I have gone into this phase of Mrs. Stanton's work because it seems important—in order that the world should properly estimate it—that it should be free from the charge of irreverence.

In religion, as in philosophy, Mrs. Stanton was universal. A person said to me the other day, "But the Freethinkers claim her." I replied, "Let them claim her; there is enough of her to go round." When we leave the little chamber in our religious home,—the Episcopalian room, the Baptist, the Methodist, or whatever apartment it may be where we learn and work and enjoy the companionship of those with the same set of limitations as ourselves,—we go out into the family living-room and meet as Christians. In our central town temple we come from these various religious houses where we are Christians, Jews, Buddhists, or bearing some other name under which men have sought to find out something about their eternal destiny, and we meet as worshipers of the unknown God. But when we leave all man-made religious shrines and go out into the great cathedral whose vaulted roof is the heavens, and whose light is the eternal stars, these distinctions are lost and we are in the presence of the Spirit of the Universe and of all the inspired souls by which It has sent Its messages to mankind. Here is the spiritual abiding-place of her who brought the Divine message of justice and freedom for women, and whose true reverence would not permit her to violate her conscience to do homage to the God of tradition.

After the union of the National and American Woman Suffrage Societies, Mrs. Stanton, who had always been at the head of the former, was elected president, and reëlected in '90 and '91, with her beloved coadjutor by her side as of old as vice-president. Then she begged to be released. In a letter written at that time she said: "My life has been a busy one,

with all my family cares and the suffrage movement, and now I want to give my time to general reading and thinking, to music, to poetry, and to study along spiritual lines." But she could not, to any extent, turn aside for her own enjoyment from the consideration of the great problems of the day. She kept watch of all official action and press comment bearing on any phase of the woman movement, and she was constantly contributing articles to periodicals on these matters that to her dying day showed all the old-time force and earnestness.

Other questions, too, concerned her greatly. She took a keen interest in having an educational qualification for the suffrage. This, she thought, would do away with the evils arising from unrestricted immigration and also wipe out an objection often made to woman suffrage—that it would double the ignorant vote—by eliminating the ignorant vote altogether. Populism, Socialism, and other Reform political movements were subjects of serious attention. I quote from her letters: "I rejoice in them all; they are the first bugle notes of the coming revolution of 'equal rights to all.' The report of that — wedding should rouse us all from our apathy and indifference to the corruption that gives millions to the few while the many suffer for shelter, food, and clothes, denied all the good things of life. . . . When the rich young man asked Jesus, 'What shall I do to be saved?' Jesus said, 'Go sell all that thou hast and give to the poor.' This text should be echoed round the globe, in all our pulpits, until those pretending to be Christians should be ashamed rather than proud of their millions."

Mrs. Stanton was a practical exponent of much that is now taught as the New Thought. Much of her instruction has already passed into common experience and acceptance; but the world will always need such a message as this, received from her years ago: "Take time for self-improvement, reading, thought, meditation. There is such a thing as being too active—living too outward a life. Most reformers fail at this point. To develop our real selves we need time alone for thought and meditation. To be always giving out and never pumping in, the well runs dry too soon."

The celebration of Mrs. Stanton's eightieth birthday by the National Council of Women was a magnificent close to her platform work. Looking from that brilliant scene in the New York theater—where she sat enthroned in flowers, all the organizations of women vying in showing her honor and testifying to their gratitude—into the world outside where hundreds of societies were also celebrating the occasion, one might regard it as showing the practical solidarity of the women of the nation in support of the principles that it had been Mrs. Stanton's life-work to inculcate.

In the ages to come a free and exalted humanity will think of Mrs. Stanton as one of the world's greatest benefactors. Wives having risen to the full stature of human beings in personal and property rights will loyally remember her efforts, which first loosed the fetters in which the common law held women in this relationship. Mothers will clasp their babes in their arms and thank God that she lived to plead for their legal right to their offspring. Children, better born and nurtured than their ancestors, will be taught how her voice was raised in their behalf. College maidens will recall her hard lot, denied admission to schools of higher learning because of her sex, and how earnestly she fought to open their doors to women, and will be grateful that they live when *all* educational opportunities are open to them. Women of all lands and climes will reverence her memory as they join hands in work for the good of the world, for they will then have the power to embody their behests in law. Men will realize that the word of Freedom was not spoken by her for women only but for them also; for—

"If *she* be small, slight-natured, miserable,
How can men grow?"

CLARA BEWICK COLBY.

Washington, D. C.

THE WOMAN OF THE PERIOD.

FOR a long period men claimed a monopoly of that convenient commodity, brains, combining to form the biggest "Trust" that was ever established. But the "Trust" is now broken. Woman has discovered her brains, and is experimenting with them in all directions.

Like many who have just inherited vast possessions, she is uncertain how to invest her newly acquired wealth to the best advantage. The feminine sex is unquestionably in a transition state. The woman of the past is no more; the woman of the future is not yet. The memory of the former is fraught with sweetness; the vision of the latter is inspiring. The woman of the present contains something of each, as must needs be. Any creature or thing in a transition state holds within itself both the past and the future. Not, however, until Nature has normally developed her material through the necessary stages do we have the perfect result. "All periods of transition are unlovely," said Henry Ward Beecher. They are certainly unsatisfying, although extremely interesting—supremely so when humanity is the object undergoing vital change.

Woman is treading many hitherto unbeaten tracks, and man is alarmed—the extremely conservative members of her own sex equally so. They are tormented by feverish visions of a womanless future, in which strange hybrid creatures will govern the world at large, usurping everywhere the offices and duties heretofore deemed sacred to man; while, as a natural sequence, an equally anomalous specimen of humanity representing man will occupy the "sphere" of woman, and universal social demoralization will prevail.

The fears of these unfortunate worthies are ludicrous enough; yet that there is some foundation for them cannot be denied. There undoubtedly exists a class of individuals, always prominent in revolutionary periods, who fully justify

their fears. We mean the fanatics, the red-hot radicals, who, impatient of Nature's slow but sure processes, would pull open the yet folded petals of a flower, thinking thus to view sooner its perfection. Alas for the folly!

Between these two classes, however, who so torment each other, is the contingent striving to preserve the golden mean. These cling to all the past that is sweet, wholesome, true, while grasping every present advantage consistent with present duty. These are the truly progressive, the normal transitionists, from whom in due time shall be evolved the real "coming woman." These are the host that move the world.

A few great leaders always get the credit of reforms, but they are simply the mouthpieces of the masses who are seething with ideas and desires they cannot express, and who joyfully follow when some one appears strong and mighty enough to voice their thoughts, convictions, and protests. It is the old story of officer and private. All honor to the great ones who lead the campaigns of human progress! But let us not forget the masses of humanity who sustain them.

To doubt that some good will eventually result from the so-called "woman movement" is to lack faith in God. No momentous movement that the world has known has been useless; in some way, to some extent, it has helped humanity onward and upward. Every such movement must reveal or emphasize some truth, crush some evil, or confer some good. There is absolutely no waste in the Divine economy.

One fact our alarmists are too prone to forget. The woman of the period is not solely the result of deliberate intention or effort on the part of her sex, but the inevitable product of varied conditions. As long as the three "Rs" were sufficient for the average man, he naturally deemed them a liberal education for the average woman; nor could she complain thereof. With public schools open to both sexes, there came a more general diffusion of education that broadened the masculine mind and proved the quality of the feminine. The capacity of the first, it must be remembered, had not been limited by popular opinion; so man had not, as had woman, first to prove that

capacity before receiving equal higher educational advantages. This the public-school system helped her to do. It still further acknowledged woman's mental capacity by employing her as preceptor, thereby greatly enlarging the sphere she had previously occupied as a teacher. We may therefore consider the public school the entering wedge between woman's meager educational resources before its establishment and her present opportunities, and an important factor in bringing about the feminine transformation that is agitating the world.

Another factor not less important was masculine demand. As man broadened intellectually he had to choose between so educating woman that she could be a sympathetic, intelligent companion to him, or relegate her to the position of drudge or mere server of physical needs and desires. Too many choose the second alternative. To some it was impossible. While not, probably, admitting mental equality for woman, he was not prepared to degrade her into a menial. Her society and companionship were a necessity to him. Companionship without the intelligent comprehension obtainable only through mental culture was obviously out of the question. That woman, therefore, might still further contribute to the comfort and happiness of man, he lengthened her educational tether, and so, unwittingly and selfishly, became a powerful factor in the intellectual advancement of woman. To his decision she responded with alacrity her ambition and consciousness of mental force. That the powers he was arousing in her have expanded and grown mighty far beyond his anticipation and control is not surprising. Humanity is always meeting with such experiences.

Not only has woman acquired education in the ordinary sense of the term, but a mental discipline in the acquiring that has strengthened and trained her reasoning faculties, sharpened her perceptions, developed executive ability and decision, balanced her judgments, and given her broader, more correct views of life and loftier conceptions of what it should be.

More than all has radical change of industrial and social conditions aided to force the American woman into her present attitude and character. From a largely agricultural, sparsely-

settled nation with small industries and commerce, we have in a century developed into one not behind any in wealth, commerce, vast cities, immense population. Six daughters, or even two, are not essential in the domestic economy of a flat as they were when the home was the manufactory in which various raw materials passed through the processes necessary to convert them into clothing and articles for household use—where food was grown and prepared for domestic consumption and market, stock raised for similar purposes, and all sewing done by hand.

Marriage or wage-earning was consequently ordained for the girls through no action or effort on their part. Marriage for mere support was too degrading to deserve any consideration. Not every woman meets the man she would care to marry; and if she does he may not reciprocate. Numberless good women who would make model wives and mothers never have a chance to prove their capacity for those relationships.

Admitting that the daughters of the middle and lower classes might find enough to do at home assisting their mothers in sewing, housework, caring for children, can the *fathers* be made to realize it? The average man thinks that his wife should be able to do all these things and enjoy unlimited leisure as well; or if ever so willing to keep his daughters at home as "Mother's" assistants, in these times of corporation and trust dominion, restriction of wages, no place for small tradesmen, he is probably unable financially to do so.

Then, too, *tempus fugit*. Parents pass away, or themselves require financial assistance. The time comes when the daughters may be obliged to support themselves and possibly others. If not fitted to do this by early training and experience, there is no chance for them. They may find a place in the families of relatives where for meager board and scanty wardrobe they are permitted to work their fingers to the bone. It must be clear that the times demand of women that they shall be self-supporting or submit to conditions to which no spirited, self-respecting woman can submit.

In selecting an occupation circumstances will not permit woman to confine herself to certain vocations. These would

obviously soon become overcrowded. Not all women can teach; sewing is unremunerative, and is, moreover, limited in quantity. Too many women starve at it now. Housework and care of children, work congenial to many women under favorable and legitimate conditions, are so undervalued that the woman who engages in them must immediately lose caste and become a social pariah, regardless of the personal and intellectual gifts and nobility of character that she may possess. She has no recourse, then, under existing conditions, but to do that, be it man's work or woman's, for which she is best fitted, and which will therefore be most *congenial*, proper, and profitable—provided she does not *underbid* man.

If social and industrial conditions are such that woman cannot be provided for, she must provide for herself; and society and man have no right to criticize her for engaging in the employment most agreeable and remunerative. If in so doing she has become the self-reliant and independent woman of the day so objectionable to preconceived notions of how far independence and self-reliance should be cultivated by woman, who is to blame? Certainly not she, but the social system that not only permits but compels her to become a wage-earner.

If she must brave the world and man, her supposed but far from actual protector, self-reliance and independence in an almost Amazonian degree are essential. Helpless female loveliness cherished and shielded by man belongs to Utopian or millennial conditions. God does not require that woman should be restricted to certain callings or He would not have furnished her with abilities for others. Those abilities, not society or man, must decide her vocation.

Another reason for the woman of our times we find in the fact that, while the importance of woman's sphere and her ability to fill it were theoretically admitted, they were practically absolutely denied. The physical and manual side of the duties of that sphere was considered mere play, the intellectual side ignored, while the financial management, esteemed quite beyond the brain of woman, was as a rule entirely controlled by the man, who paid bills himself, probably did the buying, or

expected his wife to do it quite in the dark as to how much she ought to spend. Non-comprehension and non-appreciation of the sphere of woman, and woman in her sphere, have been potent factors in forcing her out of that sphere. Nor have this ignorance and non-appreciation of the requirements—the vastness—of woman's legitimate sphere been confined to man. She herself has been as blind as he.

The present period is all-important and critical. That it is attended by false, unnatural conditions tending to disintegration of the home is undeniable. These will be remedied by that supreme educator, Experience. From that stern preceptor, woman, in common with the world at large, will learn many lessons ere she emerges from her chrysalis the "perfect woman, nobly planned."

MARIE MERRICK.

East Orange, N. J.

MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE.

A FAVORITE practise of the opponents of divorce, in the United States, is to refer to the example of the Roman Empire, which existed hundreds of years without a divorce case; but in reality the comparison is neither fair nor just to our country. It may be that the marriages of the ancient Romans were "made in heaven," and again it is possible that, having no remedy, no recourse, no escape, the unhappily wedded son of Rome resigned himself to his fate and called upon the gods to give him comfort.

In free America, thanks to the wise provisions made and the fortunate fact that marriage is a civil contract, there is release from intolerable marital conditions in divorce; and divorce is every year being considered more respectable as the prejudices inspired by ecclesiasticism wear away, and we learn to realize that these legal separations mean a yearning for better things—for more helpful surroundings, a purer atmosphere, and conscientious living.

The opponents of divorce are largely those who, if married, have been fortunate in that relation, and their happiness appears to make them narrow and selfish instead of being touched with a feeling for the mistakes of others and a desire to mitigate the sufferings of the unfortunates.

When we find that the total number of divorces in the United States for any given year since 1870 exceeds the figures for all the rest of the world, we might consider that our country is just that much in advance of the rest of the world in the desire for purity and right living.

We are told that the institution of divorce separates husbands and wives and breaks up homes. Nothing could be further from the truth. Divorce never separates, just as the marriage ceremony never unites. Each is but the symbol, the sign, which sets its seal upon that which took place before. If the husband

and wife find that they have made a mistake, and that the lives of both are being wrecked by their mutual companionship, it is their duty to separate and obtain freedom by legal process. Does divorce break up their home? An egg might be broken only to find that the contents had evaporated, leaving but the thin shell, like the veneer that covers the abiding-place of the unhappily married. How can a real *home* exist without purity, harmony, and tenderness? How can it be worthy that sacred name unless love and mutual respect have lodgment there?

It is truly said that the homes of our land are the bulwark of the nation. About these homes are gathered sacred memories of happy hours, sweet joys, noble inspirations, and all that makes for pure living and good citizenship. The home is a place symbolic of restfulness and peace, where loved ones dwell. Does divorce war upon the homes of the land? Stop and think. Do you know of a home where mutual love is the guiding star, and which is worthy the name of home, that is in any danger of being shattered by divorce? It is a mistake, a perversion of the truth indeed, to make the statement that homes are being wrecked in this way. No home that is a home indeed has been broken by divorce, and none will be; for this legal step is but the closing scene of the last act in a domestic tragedy, and, as the curtain goes down to hide the woes and wretchedness that have been exposed to the world, another is raised that brings to view a scene symbolic of purity, peace, and hope, the contemplation of which causes the hideous vision of the past to fade away—dissolved in the radiance of a better day.

It is urged that it is the duty of parents who are unhappily married to preserve their homes intact for the sake of their children; and one clergyman writing on this subject says: "There is no pathos so heartrending as that which is born of the thought of all these poor deserted children, left by their foolish heathen parents to the tender mercies of the great big world." Let us consider this matter. Is there any evidence to show that parents desert or cease to care for their children when a decree of divorce is granted? Do not the little ones usually make their home with one or the other of their parents? When a

parent is removed by *death*, children are never referred to as "deserted." In a home where love does not exist, and strife and contention rule, parents are apt to forget their obligation to their innocent offspring, who are often neglected in the whirlwind of sorrow and hatred that sweeps away all semblance of happiness from the home; but when freedom and separation come, the claims of the children are recognized and the pent-up clamoring affections go out to them. They are provided for as never before.

It is a crime to rear children in a home life where father and mother are mutually abhorrent; where love dwells not; where the contact of parents serves to bring out all the innate evil of their natures instead of being an inspiration to virtue. False and harmful ideas of marriage are absorbed by the little ones—so quick to perceive and imitate their parents. None of the rich blessings of mutual, parental love are in their inheritance, but instead they are forced to live in this unnatural atmosphere of hatred, expecting an outbreak at any moment. Can any happy memories in later years cluster around a home life like this? And yet we are told that for the sake of the children alone unhappy and unloving people should continue to dwell together! "For the sake of the children" they should be spared a home life without love and hope.

The rational, reasonable way to minimize divorce is to place barriers against easy matrimony, and make marriage a bulwark of sincere and holy purpose against which the waves of youthful impetuosity and unripe affection will dash in vain. The proposition is so plain that "he who runs may read," he who seeks shall find, he who looks will see; yet every day we read expressions from clergymen thundering against the divorce habit, devoting columns to show its alleged evils and how it should be restricted, but seldom, if ever, do they refer to the cause,—unfit marriages,—and then only with a few words in a half-hearted, timid way, as if treading on holy ground—"straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel," and failing even to see the hump.

I make an exception, in this arraignment, of Bishop J. L.

Spaulding, who recently wrote a strong article on "The Evil of Reckless Marriages," which should have wide publicity. The Bishop said: "Reckless and senseless marriages are an inexhaustible source of evil. . . . So long as this poison fountain remains open, so long will vice and pauperism continue to breed degradation and wretchedness." Bishop Spaulding speaks the truth. He does not claim that *all* marriages are holy, and he does not say "whom God hath joined" with reference to every couple united in wedlock; for he knows the statement would not be true.

It is beyond comprehension how the average clergyman can reconcile himself to that statement and also the statement that all marriages should be inviolate, when he daily hears tales of marital woes that should prove to any rational mind that certain alliances ought to be annulled by law, even as they have been perverted and destroyed in fact. "The unseen is the real."

The greatest social evil in our country is the marrying habit. There is practically no check on marriage, and young people wed at will and at times in haste, with an angry parent in pursuit. Even those below lawful age find little difficulty in getting the protection of law and are pronounced married. Many a clergyman has been made heartsick by the appearance of wedding couples who gave abundant evidence of unfitness for the sacred relation into which they recklessly entered. Instead of being a pearly stream leading to the gates of paradise, marriage thus often proves a sewer, sweeping on to further pollution.

License, license—liberty to commit an act that wrecks lives and brings a train of sorrow to be visited on coming generations, and no hand is lifted to check the crime!

What can we do about it? Make every couple procure a license, and licenses should be required in every State; but before the document is issued the prospective bride and groom should be separately examined by a competent tribunal, to ascertain their mental, moral, and general fitness for the great responsibility they are about to assume. "But this is an in-

fringement of personal liberty," is the protest I hear. Yes, infringement of liberty to "visit the sins of the father" upon helpless children—liberty to blight the flowers of hope on the bosoms of happy brides.

An acquaintance with each other of at least a year should be required from candidates for matrimony. No marriage should be legalized without the fact becoming known to the world at once, and publicity in advance of the ceremony of the intentions of the contracting parties should also be mandatory. No one should have authority to perform a wedding ceremony for a runaway couple, and clandestine marriage should be made impossible. The New Zealand law that requires a man to appear before a magistrate and certify to his intentions a month before the ceremony has much to commend it. With these safeguards in force, marriage for fun, for pique, for the gratification of foolish fancy, will be rare.

It will be urged that these restrictions are contrary to public policy—that they would check the growth of the nation and limit marriage. That is the old animal cry, and reminds one of Napoleon's famous remark: "What France needs is mothers." Napoleon himself demonstrated his consistency by breaking the heart of his faithful consort, Josephine, so that he could wed another woman who might bring him an heir to his throne. How much above the level of the brute creation is the man who deliberately breaks a woman's heart?

Everything possible should be done to make marriage difficult, and that action will make divorce rare. There will be fewer marriages, it is true; but there ought to be less, such as they are, many of them. These restrictions will not prevent the union of those who truly love each other and have passed out of the selfish period of youth, who are of proper age and fit to be married, and who can honor the sacred relation.

"The soul's mate" will wait, if necessary, for aye, even though waiting be ever "hope deferred." A true and lasting affection will endure privations and restrictions, if required, in order to gain the prize of a loving, helpful, and sympathetic companionship, the rich heritage of a happy home—a home

in which the specter of divorce can never be seen. And, in waiting, the great lesson of patience is taught, while love grows sweeter and stronger and purer because of the sacrifice.

I would say to the opponents of divorce: Open your eyes to a new and clearer vision; attune your understanding to the key-note of truth, and acknowledge that the cause of unhappy marriage lies largely in premature and ill-assorted mating. The relief is found in divorce, the remedy will be through laws supported by an enlightened and awakened public conscience that will bring marriage to the high plane, yea, to that supreme height which God designed, that it may ever represent a covenant of hearts, a union of souls in an indissoluble oneness whose influence for the good of humanity shall only end with time.

HENRY F. HARRIS.

Canton, Ohio.

A CONVERSATION

WITH

GEORGE H. SHIBLEY,

Chairman of the National Federation for Majority Rule,

ON

THE VICTORIOUS MARCH OF MAJORITY RULE.

EDITORIAL INTRODUCTION.

A direct ballot by the people on a question of public policy was taken in Massachusetts in 1777 as to the State Constitution. This referendum system for the enactment of constitutional law has been used in every State in the Union except Delaware. And in all the States the referendum has been extended to the more important questions of statutory law, such as the issuance of bonds, etc. Finally, in South Dakota, Utah, Oregon, and Switzerland the system has been extended to *all* statutory law, except urgency measures, the usual appropriations, and treaties. This wholesale reference of bills to the people is through the optional referendum; namely, the bills lie before the voters for 60 or 90 days, and during this time a small proportion of them, usually 5 per cent., have the option of ordering a direct ballot. If they do not, the bill becomes law at the end of the 60 or 90 days. Few bills are ordered to a direct ballot, for it has been found that the mere existence of the power prevents the passage of all bad measures, and only an occasional bill of a debatable nature is ordered to a ballot of the people.

For the will of the people to prevail, it has been provided, also, in the above named States and in most of the Swiss States that the voters shall have a direct initiative in addition to the indirect form. A definite proportion of the voters, usually 8 or 10 per cent., are authorized to frame bills and present them to the legislative body, which, after due consideration, must

refer its judgment to the voters, along with the bill as initiated, and refer it in such form that the voters can choose between the measures or reject both. This is the Direct Initiative by petition. The first described portion of the system is the People's Veto through the optional referendum. The result of the system is Majority Rule in combination with the Representative System.

To establish this system in national affairs, it was supposed, until recently, that it was necessary to secure an amendment to the Federal Constitution—an instrument that is almost unalterable. But Mr. Shibley, a lawyer and law writer, who has devoted himself for the last eight years to the investigation of economic, political, and social problems, has discovered a system whereby a people's veto and direct initiative can be installed without changing the Federal Constitution. It is the adoption of rules of procedure in the national House and Senate, and a request by Congress to the States that provision be made for the submission of questions of national policy along with the election of Congressmen. The practicability of the plan is undisputed.

This discovery was made soon after election day, 1900. It was the result of a determined search for a practicable method for installing a people's veto and direct initiative in national affairs. Mr. Shibley and others were convinced that the trusts and other private monopolies could not be controlled until the voters should first secure an increase of power through the direct ballot—the referendum and the initiative.

Early in December, 1900, Mr. Shibley moved from New York City to Washington, D. C., and has devoted himself and his income to the establishment of Majority Rule in nation, State, and city. In June, 1901, he published a 400-page volume entitled "The Trust Problem Solved," and distributed about fourteen hundred copies among the political writers and students of the country. The following month the rule-of-procedure system—the Winnetka System, as it is frequently termed—was indorsed by the National Direct Legislation League, and by the Second Social and Political Conference, held at Detroit. Soon there was a practically unanimous sentiment by constitutional lawyers and students that the direct ballot can be installed in national affairs without altering the words of the written Constitution. Several State conventions and one national platform have demanded that this majority rule system should be installed as to interstate com-

merce and other national questions. Organized labor in many of its conventions has likewise indorsed the plan. Last June the common council in Detroit adopted the system as to city affairs. A majority of the aldermen elected in Chicago last spring were pledged to the system for city affairs, but one-half the entire number are hold-overs.

Mr. Shibley's method of investigating a subject is minutely to classify the data, thus covering the entire field. This method he applied to the material pertaining to the referendum and the initiative, and it brings clearly to view the fact that Congress and the other legislative bodies are continued. The effect of the addition of a people's veto through the optional referendum, and a direct initiative by petition, is simply an improvement in the representative system, but a far-reaching improvement. Some of the details are shown in the volume published by Mr. Shibley in 1901, but a much more complete description is in an extra number of the *American Federationist* of January 15, 1902, the official magazine of the American Federation of Labor. Several new questions are developed, and the author's conclusion is that "the new questions as to the system of government and the method for installing it are such as must revolutionize the prevailing ideas. These questions are such," declares Mr. Shibley, "*that the referendum and the initiative can be adopted with an ease and rapidity that places the system as much ahead of the prevailing campaign methods as the telegraph is ahead of the stage-coach.*"

Subsequent events are justifying this prophecy, as the following news concerning the election shows. Forty-thousand copies of the extra number of the *American Federationist* were published and distributed by Mr. Shibley. This led to widespread action by the labor unions and other organizations. In June a national campaign was well under way, and the National Federation for Majority Rule, of which Mr. Shibley is chairman, published an Address and Questions to candidates in many of the States and to all the Congressional candidates in the country. The Federation published also 40,000 copies of a 72-page pamphlet, and scores of leaflets and smaller pamphlets. A review of the campaign was published in THE ARENA for November, and editorial notice of the campaign has been made. Election day is past, and we herewith present the net results of the campaign throughout the country. In most of the States a campaign for the referendum has been under way for many years.

"THE VICTORIOUS MARCH OF MAJORITY RULE."

Q. Mr. Shibley, will you give our readers the net results, so far as you have been able to collect them, of the recent election as they affect the question of Majority Rule?

A. In Illinois the vote in favor of the referendum and the initiative was 6 to 1. In the following States, two-thirds of the members of the legislature are pledged to allow the people to vote upon the question of a constitutional amendment for the referendum and the initiative: Missouri, Colorado, California, and Washington. In Montana and Massachusetts a majority of the members of the legislature are pledged. To secure the necessary two-thirds vote, petitions are to be circulated. In Rhode Island there is a fair prospect of securing a constitutional amendment. In Pennsylvania a determined effort is being made.

In all the Northern States where legislatures were recently elected, organized labor has declared for the referendum and the initiative. Most of the State Federations of Labor have questioned the legislative candidates of all the parties, published their replies, and in other ways the vote of organized labor was thrown against the candidates who opposed an increase of power in the voters.

In Los Angeles a city charter was adopted that provides for the referendum and the initiative. The vote upon this section was 8 to 1. In Colorado a constitutional amendment gives Denver home rule and the referendum and the initiative. It will be remembered that last June the voters in Oregon adopted the referendum and the initiative by an 11-to-1 vote—all the political parties having declared for the system, together with many of the leading officials, including the United States Senators. Some years ago the system was installed in South Dakota and Utah. Last winter the Nevada legislature voted to submit the question to the people, and it will go to them after another legislature has agreed to submit it.

This is a mere outline of the election returns. The conclusion to be drawn is that nearly all the States west of Indiana

show a practically unanimous sentiment for the referendum. In Indiana and the States to the north and east there is a strong sentiment, and one that will yield a big majority for the referendum whenever a vote is taken. The only question is, How can the adoption of the referendum and the initiative be brought to a ballot of the people?

Q. What is the progress of the referendum movement in national affairs?

A. The campaign for members of the National House and Senate has been remarkably successful. It has been found easier to secure pledges in national than in State affairs. In Missouri alone, nine of the sixteen Congressmen are pledged to rules of procedure whereby the people may instruct their representatives. The existing system for instructing is inefficient. Vaguely stated policies of legislation are proposed by the few men who constitute the national conventions; then the people choose between two sets of these proposals, and the few men elected to the national House and Senate are clothed with full power to legislate as they themselves may choose, except as limited by the vague statements in the party platform, and as limited by the Federal Constitution as construed by men appointed by the party in power. *The remedy, manifestly, is to provide an EFFICIENT system for instructing the representatives in Congress.* The system to which the Missouri Congressmen are pledged is equivalent to the referendum and the initiative. The chief advantage is that no change in the Federal Constitution is required, and it is practicable to make the improved system the sole issue in the campaign of 1904 if it is opposed by one or both the great parties. If there is an open opposition to the demand for Majority Rule in place of Rule by the Few, then this question will be the sole issue.

Q. Has there been any open opposition to Majority Rule by the Democratic or the Republican party?

A. No, most decidedly. The disagreement between the Republican and Democratic parties is as to legislative policies and not as to the system of government, which is based upon equal rights—majority rule. The trust magnates and the

men whom they elect to Congress are secretly opposed to majority rule; but every candidate when he goes before the people for their votes impliedly agrees that the will of the majority should prevail. Therefore, in the recent campaign, wherever a considerable body of voters in a district have questioned the candidates of both the parties as to their attitude concerning the establishment of an effective system of majority rule, *it has forced the candidates of both the great parties to declare that, if elected, they would vote to install the system. In no case has a candidate openly opposed the demand for the referendum and the initiative.* It follows that in the coming city elections, State elections, and national election in 1904, the candidates of both the great parties will pledge themselves for Majority Rule—if they are questioned during the campaign, and if there is an organized demand for majority rule.

But we need not wait for the next campaign. The voters have the right to *instruct* their representatives. "Petition" is the term frequently used, but it is a misnomer. The American people are the sovereign power, and the aldermen, State legislators, and Congressmen are their servants. The presentation of a request signed by a majority of the voters in a district is sure to result in the desired action by the representative. This right to instruct is recognized in all parts of the country. The effective clauses in the Chinese Exclusion law of 1882 were the result of the signed request of about 2,000,000 voters. The movement was engineered by organized labor. Two years ago a Mormon Congressman was unseated largely as a result of instructions by the people, a goodly proportion of whom were women. The Louisiana Lottery was barred from the mails as the result of instructions whereby the necessary votes for passing the Anti-Lottery bill were secured; the Declaration of Independence was the result of instructions to the men who signed it, and a second Declaration of Independence—independence from the trusts and "boss" rule—can be secured by instructions.

Q. What is the program for furthering the Majority Rule cause?

A. An Address to the People is about to be issued by the Referendum Leagues, Majority Rule Leagues, and other organizations, and by individuals—for example, the chairmen of the legislative committees of organized labor, and of the Grange. The immediate object is to federate all the organizations and individuals that are injured by trust rule, and therefore should demand majority rule and federate in a non-partizan way; that is, *organize to influence the action of the candidates of the two great parties* WITHOUT FORMING A THIRD PARTY.

Q. What can reasonably be expected from this system?

A. It is not an experiment. Non-partizan organization for political purposes is engaged in by every interest in society that is of importance. For example, the Granges are demanding legislation; organized labor is demanding legislation; business men's organizations are demanding legislation. All of them want to curb the trusts, and to accomplish this the voters must clothe themselves with the right to a ballot upon each question—they must install the optional referendum and the direct initiative. To make this the issue and thereby secure it without even a contest at the polls, there are being federated the various interests that are opposed to the trust evils.

Q. Are you sure that the mere questioning of candidates by a determined minority will force the candidates of both the parties to declare that they will vote to establish the system?

A. It was fully demonstrated in the recent campaign in Missouri, Colorado, California, Washington, Montana, and Massachusetts. In these States organized labor questioned all the candidates for the legislature, and wherever a considerable number of voters were demanding the referendum and the initiative both the candidates agreed to vote for the system, or one of them refused to reply and was defeated.

It is an established fact, therefore, that no candidate can be elected if he openly opposes the demand for majority rule, or if he fails to reply provided a considerable number of voters are demanding the referendum. Such being the case, a practically unanimous delegation can be secured in each elec-

tion for aldermen, members of the legislature, and Congress. To bring this about there should be organized at once in each city and county a Non-Partizan Federation for Majority Rule.

If there is any hesitancy about calling the meeting, organized labor in each city will take the lead. The recent convention of the American Federation of Labor at New Orleans requested the central and local unions in the country—about 14,000 in number—to appoint committees to agitate for the referendum in national affairs. The first bit of work is the calling of a meeting for the establishment of a local organization in which the referendum sentiment of the community can group itself and do the necessary work. In the country districts the Granges will take the lead. There are also the Single Tax societies, Anti-Saloon leagues, Turner societies, etc. The Young People's societies and even the churches are becoming interested in the work. At the recent congress of the Episcopal Church a half day was devoted to "The Moral Aspects of the Referendum," and the papers and speeches are being widely circulated through the religious press. These forces are to assist the referendum aldermen, members of the legislature, Senators, and Representatives in bringing the question to where it will become an issue in city, State, and nation.

Q. What action has been taken by organized labor to form local Federations for Majority Rule?

A. Since last January there has been a growing movement in this direction. On March 3d the State Federation of Labor in Connecticut issued an address to the unions in the State, urging them to work in a non-partizan way for the election of aldermen pledged to the referendum and initiative, through rules of procedure in the common council. In Norwalk and other places in the State, non-partizan federations were organized and many of the aldermen were pledged. In Texas an address was issued by the Direct Legislation Committee of the State Federation of Labor; and in Houston, San Antonio, Cleburne, and other places in the State an efficient campaign was conducted. At Geneva, Ill., as the result of action by the Village Improvement Association, the rule-of-procedure sys-

tem was installed. At Chicago a non-partizan Federation for Majority Rule questioned the Aldermanic candidates of all the parties, and a majority of the men elected are pledged to the rule-of-procedure system; but as one-half the council are hold-overs the system has not yet been adopted. At Topeka, Kan., and other cities in the country, organized labor has taken the lead in organizing local Federations for Majority Rule. In Detroit a non-partizan federation has installed the referendum. In Toronto, Canada, a similar organization, started by organized labor, is making the referendum the issue in the city campaign, with every prospect of immediate success.

Q. Have any State Federations been formed?

A. Yes. The Kansas Federation for Majority Rule was organized last spring, and it questioned all the legislative candidates in the State. It principally represented the organized wage-earners of the State. The Grange and other farmers' organizations had not yet declared for the referendum, and therefore the questioning of candidates had little effect in the rural districts. The organization is to be extended into every county.

In Texas the Direct Legislation Committee of the State Federation of Labor called a meeting to organize the Texas Non-Partizan Federation for Majority Rule. An enthusiastic meeting was held and every candidate in the State was questioned; but as there had not been sufficient time to get the farmers into the movement, and as nominations had been made, which are equivalent to an election, further work must be done to secure the submission of a constitutional amendment. The State Federation is circulating instructions to submit a constitutional amendment.

In Missouri there was no formal federation of the referendum forces, but a close alliance existed between the Missouri Direct Legislation League, The Joint Committee of Organized Labor, and the Single Tax and other non-partizan reform associations.

The same sort of coöperation took place in Illinois, Colorado, and California. In the State of Washington there was com-

plete coöperation between organized labor and the Granges. Each organization questioned the candidates of all the parties, and as a result the vote in the legislature will be almost unanimous to submit a constitutional amendment for the referendum. In Montana organized labor was practically alone, but more than a majority of the legislature are pledged. To secure the necessary two-thirds, instructions are to be circulated.

In Massachusetts organized labor coöperated with several business men's organizations, and since election day quite a number of Granges have passed resolutions instructing their representatives in the legislature to vote to submit a constitutional amendment.

Q. Since election time the American Federation of Labor has held its annual convention. What action as to the referendum was taken?

A. The following declaration was unanimously agreed to:

"Whereas, For ten years the American Federation of Labor has been declaring the need for an increase of power in voters, to be attained by the adoption of the referendum and the initiative; that is, (1) by extending the veto power of the voters so as to include not only the changes in the written constitution but all the lesser changes in the laws, except the usual appropriation acts and measures immediately necessary for the preservation of the public peace, health, or safety; and (2) by clothing five or eight per cent. of the voters with a direct initiative; therefore,

"Resolved, That the Twenty-second Annual Convention of the American Federation of Labor reaffirms the demand of the Order for more political power in its members and in the people at large, and to this end demands a people's veto, the direct ballot to be called for by not to exceed 5 per cent. of the voters; and a direct initiative by not to exceed 8 per cent. of the voters; and

"Resolved, That the questioning of the legislative candidates as practised with great success by the State branches in Massachusetts, Missouri, Illinois, California, and Washington is herewith recommended; and

"Resolved, That, in order to unify the action for the securing of a people's veto and direct initiative in national affairs, the legislative or specially appointed committee of the several

bodies in the American Federation of Labor, including the central and local unions, shall constitute committees to co-operate with the American Federation of Labor Executive Council for securing and using the direct initiative and the people's veto."

This program is of great importance. There is indorsed the non-partizan system of politics whereby the referendum was carried in the recent election in Massachusetts, Missouri, Illinois, Colorado, California, and Washington; and steps are taken to unify action in national affairs and apply the same wonder-working system of non-partizan politics. The 14,000 unions are requested to appoint majority rule committees. The first work of a committee, manifestly, is to call a meeting to organize a local federation for the referendum. Such an organization unifies the forces in each community and equips them for active and efficient work. In many cities the federation has already been made, as we have seen.

Q. What is the attitude of the *farmers* of the country?

A. It was the farmers who led in the movement of thirty years ago to place the railways under State control. And success was attained. The Granger uprising was participated in by business men and wage-earners. Through a decision of the Supreme Court, the larger part of the control of railways was transferred to Congress, and since then the farmers' organizations have been endeavoring to prevent discriminations in rates and to establish reasonable rates. In this they have been assisted by the organized millers, live stock shippers, manufacturers, merchants, etc., but without success. These interests are forced, therefore, to work for an increase of power in the voters—a change in the system of government. This increased power can be secured through a constitutional amendment for the referendum and the initiative, or by the adoption of rules of procedure whereby the voters can instruct their representatives. The Oregon State Grange was the leader in the movement for the referendum in State affairs, while in the State of Washington and other commonwealths the Grange is working for the system, and without doubt these organiza-

tions will help to establish an effective system of majority rule in national affairs.

Q. You have named the States in which the referendum sentiment has crystallized; will you tell us how many Senators and Representatives are pledged to the program and who they are?

A. The Congressmen from Missouri are Judge De Armond, Champ Clark, Judge Shakelford, Charles H. Cochran, C. W. Hamlin, Richard Bartholdt, James J. Butler, W. D. Vandiver, and Robert Lamar. The seven other Congressmen from Missouri are pledged to the system by the platforms of their party, which declare that the referendum and the initiative should be established "wherever practicable." The Senator who will be elected from Missouri, ex-Governor Stone, is pledged to the system. In Illinois the Senator to be elected is Congressman Albert R. Hopkins, who gave to the people of Illinois the following pledge:

"I favor any principle—I care not what it may be called—that will enlarge the power of the people on all questions, State and national, that affect the well-being of the citizens."

In Minneapolis, ex-Governor John Lind will go to Congress pledged to the referendum and the initiative, to be installed by rules of procedure. W. R. Hearst, who will be in the next Congress, has long been a staunch advocate of the referendum. Organized labor is responsible for the election of D. L. D. Granger in Rhode Island, and in Pennsylvania George Howell, of Scranton, Marcus E. L. Kline, of Allentown, and J. H. Shull, of Stroudsburg. In San Francisco the two Labor candidates for Congress, indorsed by the Democratic party, were elected; namely, E. J. Livernash and Wm. J. Wynn. All the other Democrats are pledged to the referendum and the initiative by their national platform; while the Republicans from the Middle and Western States must follow the sentiment of their constituents or make up their minds to quit politics. In the Eastern States organized labor holds the balance of power and will bring the Senators and Representatives into line.

Q. What action by the readers of THE ARENA do you recommend?

A. In each community a meeting should be called to organize a Non-Partizan Federation for Majority Rule. The call should be written at once, signed by as many as is practicable, and published. A copy of the constitution, ready for adoption, will be mailed if request be sent to the Non-Partizan Federation for Majority Rule, 38 Bliss Building, Washington, D. C.

THE TYRANNY OF SERVANTS.

A FABLE, WITH ITS PRESENT-DAY APPLICATIONS.

BY CARL S. VROOMAN.*

While cycling in Central Asia I became so infatuated with the wild beauty of the mountains, lakes, and forests of one of the regions through which I passed, and so interested in the quaint habits of life and picturesque costumes of its inhabitants, that I engaged a house, hired servants, and determined to settle there for a year. The first day in my new home, about three o'clock in the afternoon, I ordered my carriage out. To my amazement word came back that the evening was the best time to drive, and that the carriage would be around at 9 o'clock. Indignant at such impudence on the part of servants, I hunted up the coachman and told him I did not care what was the "best" time, that the present moment was *my* time, and that I intended to rule my own house. He replied gravely that this was impossible—that, as every one knew, excepting alone my honored self, when a coachman was hired it was his duty and privilege to control and manage the horses and carriages as he thought best. "If your excellent highness does not approve of my poor services, you are in no way bound to hire me *next year*."

I then had recourse to a lawyer. "Is it possible," I demanded, "that I must submit to the ignorance and impudence of this rascal for a whole year? Is there no redress?"

I was quickly informed that not only did my coachman have complete control of my stables,—deciding for me when I was to drive and ride and when to walk,—but that my cook decided when and what I was to eat, and that the housekeeper, if she wished, could send the maid in to sweep my study and interrupt me just as I was most deeply absorbed in my literary

*Regent of Kansas Agricultural College.

work. My only redress, he said, was to wait until their term of tyranny (he called it "service") had expired, and then employ a new set of tyrants, or "servants," in their place. He averred that most of them consulted their master's wishes when it didn't interfere with their established methods of doing things, and when it was not to their financial interest to do otherwise. "The worst objection is not their ignorance, but their rascality," he continued; "they are all pretty apt to steal more than their salary by paying double price for everything and getting a fat rebate."

I paid him for his comforting words, and after pacing the streets for three hours I consulted the ablest lawyer in the place. This one told me I was a fool—and proved it by collecting \$20 from me for his information. "This system," he said, "relieves you of all thought and worry and responsibility concerning household matters. It is the best system the ingenuity of man has yet devised. If you would stop dabbling in domestic affairs, trying to be at once a coachman, cook, and housekeeper,—if you would attend to your literary work, which you are qualified by education and training to perform, and would allow them to attend to the work for which they are especially trained,—you would come out money ahead in the end."

"But," I said, "as fast as I make money, and perhaps faster, they will steal it."

"Oh, tut! tut!—you are simply too lazy to work. You should have been born a woman; then you could have become a housekeeper, unless you proved too lazy."

For two weeks I strove to accustom myself to the peculiar habits of this peculiar people. Every day my American instinct of freedom grew more exasperated; every day I was getting more desperate. I was on the verge of nervous collapse and madness when I finally gave up the fight and beat an ignominious retreat out of the country between two days.

I was relating this experience to a gentleman in Switzerland one day and was highly incensed when he replied: "But, my dear sir, this is something after the fashion in which you

manage, or rather are managed by, your public servants—called 'government officials'—in America. You hire a legislature or a Congress just as these savages hire a cook. Your legislature makes out its bill of fare of laws, and forces them down your throat whether you want them or not."

"But," I argued, "a legislature having time and opportunity to study and discuss these questions is supposed to know better what we need than the mass of people."

"Likewise a cook," he replied, "by study and experience is supposed to know better than the average man what food and what preparations of food are most delicious and healthful."

"How would you have it managed, then?"

"How did you want your servants to manage in Asia?" he replied.

"I wanted the coachman to advise me as to the most beautiful roads in that region, as to the most favorable hours for driving, and on all other points connected with his department—but I certainly insisted on my right to make the final decision as to where, when, and how I was to go. Likewise, I expected the cook to use all his skill, ingenuity, and science in preparing my bill of fare—but I did not feel it necessary to eat veal, which always gives me indigestion, whenever the cook thought proper, or to allow limburger cheese on the table because my culinary artist admired its peculiar perfume. I furthermore wanted the privilege of ordering tripe, sauerkraut, or ham and eggs* when I saw fit, even though he considered them not to be proper food for a gentleman."

"In just this way," he said, "would I have the people manage their legislature. When it, as the people's servant, has exerted its intellect, has applied all its knowledge and prepared a bill of fare of laws to the best of its ability, its employer and master, the people, should have the privilege of revising this bill of fare and rejecting any of these laws it sees fit. This is

*Wm. K. Vanderbilt's \$10,000-a-year chef is said to have left him because Mr. Vanderbilt exercised the right of "initiative" and ordered a plain, common-sense lunch in place of the Parisian dainties that the chef considered "the only proper thing."

what is technically known as the 'Referendum.' Again, as you say, perhaps the master may desire some dish that the cook does not like to prepare. He certainly ought to have the privilege of ordering that dish. Just so—the people may desire some law that for good or bad reasons the legislature does not favor. It is certainly within the province of the people as a sovereign power to demand and secure any such law. This right is what is technically known as the 'Initiative.' ”

“But,” I said, “we are told by college professors and leading statesmen that if the people would waste less time discussing questions that are too deep for them, and dabbling in politics, and would buckle down to hard work they could make plenty of money and we should have less talk about ‘hard times.’ ”

“Precisely what your second attorney told you about dabbling in domestic affairs,” interrupted the Swiss; “but you will remember you replied that as fast as you made money, perhaps a little faster, your servants would steal it. That is exactly what your public servants and their ‘pals,’ commonly known as ‘bosses,’ corporation lobbyists, and financiers, are doing. The legislature of Illinois a few years ago gave to Yerkes \$25,000,000 worth of franchises in spite of the impotent protest of every taxpayer in the State, regardless of party. The United Gas Improvement Company of Philadelphia, the same year, purchased the city council at a good fat figure and was thus enabled to lease for thirty years, at an exceedingly lean and low figure, the gas plant that the city had owned and operated for fifty-six years. This nauseating performance was strenuously but ineffectually opposed by every decent ‘American sovereign’ (?) in the city. The Referendum would have rendered such robberies impossible.

“There is one feature of your American System of Public Service,” he continued, “for which I find no analogy in the domestic customs of your Asiatic tribe—and that is your Supreme Court. Let us imagine one. Suppose that when you leased the house the owner had said: ‘There are three wise, virtuous old servants who go with the property. They are

engaged to work on the place as long as they desire to remain. Of course, you will pay their salary, and they are your servants; but you cannot discharge them at the end of the year, as you may the others.' Suppose that these old patriarchs were held in great esteem by the rest of the servants and were consulted regarding all matters of uncertainty and dispute as a final authority. After much wheedling and coaxing and threatening and insisting, we will say that you had finally persuaded the cook, coachman, and housekeeper to do about as you wished—when suddenly, on a complaint of the stable boy, this triune tyrant would step in and say: 'No; your new-fangled notions cannot prevail. They are contrary to the traditions, customs, and rules that have prevailed here for more than a century.' You would then know how the 'sovereign people' in your country must feel when—after long years of waiting and sacrifice and labor they have finally succeeded in electing Representatives and President and Senate all in sympathy with a desired reform, and in spite of bribery and intimidation from lobbyists and 'bosses' have held them firmly together until the law is passed and the will of the 'sovereign people' seems triumphant—suddenly the Supreme Court steps in and declares the whole thing 'unconstitutional!' Such a catastrophe can scarcely be described. Such a power is not held by the crowned heads of Europe; yet you pretend to give the king-ridden countries of the Continent instruction and example in free government!"

"There is a way to change the Constitution," I objected.

"Yes; but 'strait is the gate and narrow is the way, . . . and few there be that find it.' It requires a two-thirds majority in both houses of Congress, or a majority in the legislatures of two-thirds of the States, even to propose an amendment. It must then be ratified by the conventions or legislatures of three-fourths of all the States. In fact, it is actually *impossible* to amend the Constitution except under a most extraordinary concurrence of circumstances. Not since 1869 has any one party had a majority large enough to do this, and then only because of the temporary Northern unanimity caused by the

war and the fact that part of the opposition Southern States were still disfranchised.

"The Referendum and Initiative," he continued, "would remove this all but insuperable obstacle between the people and desired reforms; for any law passed by a vote of the sovereign people must be constitutional, inviolable, and indestructible by a Supreme Court or by any other power on earth except the people themselves.

"The details of the Swiss system of direct legislation differ in the various cantons. The three main types are: First, the *Landsgemeinde* meetings, similar to your New England town-meetings. Second, the Compulsory Referendum, according to which all laws must be referred to the people for their approval or rejection. Third, the Optional Referendum, according to which measures that the Legislature has originated and passed, if agreeable to the people, after ninety days become laws. If not agreeable to the people and five per cent. of them so petition, such measures must be referred back to be voted upon, and thus finally accepted or rejected by the people themselves. The initiative is the right of seven per cent. of the people to propose a law. This law can sometimes be accepted and passed by Congress, but can in no case be rejected except by a majority vote of the people themselves."

I believe my Swiss friend was right, and that the people of America cannot too soon relieve their public servants of their power to become tyrants.

TOPICS OF THE TIMES.

By B. O. FLOWER.

PRESIDENT ELIOT AND UNION LABOR.

I. PRINCIPAL CAUSES LEADING TO THE EDUCATOR'S MIS- APPREHENSION OF THE SUBJECT DISCUSSED.

It is extremely difficult for a man to be fair, impartial, and judicial in spirit when discussing a subject upon which his whole training has been along a certain line or bias; and this is especially true when the individual in question is constantly in an atmosphere favorable to his preconceived views, and when his business or the institution with which he is connected is largely indebted to favors bestowed by those who have a pecuniary interest in the general acceptance of the opinions he entertains.

A very striking illustration of this character was given in President Eliot's recent utterance on trade-unions. That the honored head of Harvard University desired to be fair and just is not questioned, but that his views were largely based upon statements and arguments emanating from corporate and capitalistic influence was quite evident—so evident, indeed, that one friend in discussing those parts of his argument in which he criticized the trade-unions said: "One might almost have imagined that the president of the great university which so recently received from Mr. J. Pierpont Morgan a gift of one million dollars, and which is constantly receiving princely donations from those who have amassed large fortunes through special privileges and the exploitation of labor, held a brief from the corporations."

I think there is little doubt that President Eliot's views and expressions would have been materially modified had he taken the pains better to inform himself by a sympathetic study of the other side of the question. His views were based on assertions that are constantly reiterated by the editors of corporation-owned journals, but that are largely false, and when not

positively untrue are misleading and deceptive in character. This fact will become very evident when we examine the following views of the distinguished educator in the light of the facts involved. Take, for example, the claim that the labor unions attempt to prevent the young apprentices learning or becoming masters in their trade by a close limitation of the number of apprentices that shall be permitted in a shop. In speaking on trade-unions before the Economic Club of Boston, President Eliot said—(Because of some question as to the accuracy of the newspaper reports of this address, we quote from the verbatim stenographic report of the address as taken down at the time, and which was published in full in the *Boston Post* of November 21):

"The labor union as a rule undertakes to prevent the education of young people for their trade. I have read many constitutions of trade-unions, and I have very seldom seen one in which there was not a close limitation on the number of apprentices that should be trained in a shop. Now, that is an interference with one of the most precious rights of Americans—with what all our educational institutions stand for—freedom of education for any trade or profession that the American youth wants to fit himself for. I will invite my labor friends here to go into the unions with all their might, and get that un-American doctrine out of their constitution."

In an address by President Eliot a few days later, before the Colonial Club of Cambridge, the above charge was repeated and elaborated. Now, the mental picture evidently before the mind of the university president, and that which it was intended to convey to his hearers, was that of the old-time apprentice in the days antedating the age of the machine. In the olden time it will be remembered that youths were bound out to masters in some trade—such, for example, as shoemaking, harness and saddle making, carpentering, etc. The master was bound to teach the apprentice the trade—not one branch of it, as, for example, tacking or sewing the sole of the shoe, but all branches—so that at the close of the apprenticeship the youth would be competent, by virtue of his education, to engage independently in the trade because he had received an all-round education in the craft. Furthermore, the master workman was not at liberty to discharge the apprentice bound to him without good and sufficient cause, arising from the ill action of said apprentice.

That was the order in the old days. Indeed, I think we may say that it was the prevailing rule at the time of President

Eliot's early youth; and one would almost imagine that the distinguished educator had been taking a Rip Van Winkle slumber for the last fifty or sixty years, in order to account for his seeming ignorance of the new order, in which a man or a boy now becomes more frequently than aught else merely a cog in a great machine.

The thing against which the labor unions are battling is not an all-round industrial education that shall render the child a master workman in some special craft, but the unlimited employment in some special departments of our mines and mills of boys and girls who should be in the common schools or in industrial schools. If the old order prevailed to-day, with the old mutual obligations of master and apprentice, and with the end to be achieved an all-round proficiency in a trade, any general attempt of the character described would be open to criticism; but nothing could be more unjust or absurd than to arraign as a crime or a wrong the efforts of the trade-unions to protect the children on the one hand and the bread-winning heads of families on the other from the rapacity of modern mercantile Molochs, who seek to fill the factories with children or youths, ostensibly employed as apprentices, but in fact as so many cogs in the wheels of commerce or feeders for machines, who can be secured for little or nothing to displace the fathers in the same factories, and who may at any time be dismissed by the employer if he chances to find that he can secure other boys or girls at a lower figure.

This changes the whole face of the case, and as a matter of fact the action of the unions on this point has, as a rule, been just, wise, and humanely beneficent instead of the reverse, as intimated by President Eliot.

Had the critic taken the pains to come into sympathetic *rapport* with the other side—had he gone to some thoughtful and intelligent leader of labor's hosts and explained his views—he would have been shown the falsity of the oft-exploded sophistry that reckless capitalistic journals that pretend to be conservative are constantly retailing; because the labor leader would not only have controverted the erroneous and misleading statements, but he would have taken him through the modern factories and shops and have shown him by ocular demonstration how entirely unlike are present-day conditions to those that prevailed when the educator was a youth.

It may be that there have been instances in recent decades where trade-unions have acted unjustly regarding youths learn-

ing trades, but such instances, if any, are the exception and not the rule. In the vast majority of cases the restrictions insisted upon have been beneficent.

II. ATTEMPTS TO LIMIT OUTPUT.

A second charge made by President Eliot was that the trade-unions attempted to limit the output of goods. I quote the exact words of the president as stenographically taken down:

"Now, there is another principle which as a principle of all the unions, it seems to me, fights against the true development of a manly character—it is the principle of limiting the individual output of a laborer. Now, that permeates the constitutions of labor unions not only in this country but also in Europe, and especially in England. Now, that fights against the principle of the development of human nature."

Here again the educator is found fighting against something quite obsolete in the history of American trade-unionism. However true this may have been some years ago, however true it may be to-day among unorganized workers or in union circles in the Old World, it is not a criticism applicable to trade-unions in the New World at the present time. This fact was admirably brought out by President Gompers of the American Federation of Labor, in the following words, when answering this charge:

"Now, I want to say something about the limitation of output. It is true that many years ago that was the policy of workmen, and in the case of unorganized workmen it is positively so. But in the union of labor it is not so. The organized labor movement predicates its efforts not on the limitation of output, but a reduction in the hours of their daily labor.

"There is not a country on the face of the earth in which the workingmen, the organized workingmen, have so readily accepted the introduction of new machines and new tools of labor as the organizations of labor have in the United States.

"Do you think for a moment it were possible to have introduced the machines and tools of labor with such rapidity, with such success so that we have become the envy of the world, if organized labor in America had constantly and persistently fought the machines and fought their introduction? Never! The charge that organized labor limits output is a libel invented by those who do not know, or those who do know and mischievously use it in their antagonism to our movement."

III. OPPOSITION TO SHORTER HOURS OF LABOR.

Again, President Eliot seems to imagine that the battle for a shorter day is a warfare against human development instead of a struggle for a fuller, truer, and better life. This position is so amazing, so incredible, that it is difficult to believe that the distinguished head of America's greatest university should go on record as he did when he made the following remarks:

"There is another similar doctrine taught by trade-unions which also militates against right human development in the same way. Labor unions always seem to regard labor as a curse. They always try to limit the amount of labor. In Genesis labor is represented as a curse—'In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread.' Now, we do not generally consider the labor unions as religious organizations, yet they seem to have swallowed that doctrine whole."

Here is a direct attack against the battle for shorter hours in the work-day, and, astounding as it may seem, it comes from an educator. There is no fact, I think, better established in the history of recent times than that the moral and mental condition of the laboring men has been improved whenever the hours of labor for the work-day have been reduced. Indeed, on this point it is interesting to call to mind the recent testimony of two experts. In an address delivered before the Civic Federation in New York on the ninth of December, A. F. Weber, the statistician of the New York Bureau of Labor, gave it as his experience that the result of the shorter day was to render workmen more effective, intelligent, and inventive. He furthermore testified that a purer family life was lived by workmen where the hours of labor had been reduced; while Vice-president Harburg of the American Economic Association positively declared that actual experience in localities where the shorter day had been introduced showed that the morals of the community had markedly improved.

To us it is one of the chief glories of trade-unionism that it has been able to reduce the hours in which a man is compelled to toil over one kind of work, with its wearying monotony—work that is frequently rendered soul-deadening in influence, as in cases of miners condemned to the dark, prison-like chambers from which the varying beauty of Nature and aught that could stimulate the imagination is banished; or as in the case of those who spend their lives amid the frightful heat of the great foundries, or in the midst of the distracting din of many looms. Few efforts made in behalf of the en-

franchisement of man more justly challenge the admiration and sympathy of every educator as well as of every large-souled humanitarian than this warfare for a shorter day. How far, how very far, must President Eliot have wandered from the ideal of fraternity, of justice, and of the normal development and education of all the people, when his vision can be so dimmed by the spectacles of class interests and commercial feudalism as to give rise to the above expressions!

In order that the toiler might live rather than merely exist; in order that he might have time to read, to think, and to grow intellectually; in order that he might become acquainted with his family and enjoy a little of the sweetness of the home, which enriches life and develops the heart side of human nature; in order that he might, if he had a little patch of land or a home, find time to cultivate a garden or to beautify and improve his dwelling, and thus relieve the frightful monotony of toil that knows no change—the labor unions of America have battled for a shorter day. And I do not think I exaggerate when I say that no nobler conflict has been fought on American soil than this, or one more potentially beneficent or important; because it concerns, not merely the well-being of the individual and the oncoming generations, but the very life of free institutions—the victory of democracy.

President Eliot, after criticizing the efforts of the trade-unions to shorten the hours of the work-day, thus continues:

"In my opinion the only proper limitation on a man's labor is that quantity which his health and strength enable him to perform without injury. And that is not a curse, but a joy. . . . The doctrines of the labor unions do not come up to the standard of human nature. On the contrary, they urge every individual to produce as little as he can, and to get as much money as he can for it."

Now, we are far from indorsing President Eliot's opinions as to the proper limitation for a man's labor. Life, if it is to be progressive and expansive, calls for far more than hours necessary for rest and recreation. It calls for time in which the mind can be educated, the imagination touched, and the heart warmed. If it is said that the hours that a workingman spends in reading or improvement are spent in work, we reply that that is not what is comprehended by President Eliot, as he is criticizing the labor unions for seeking to lessen the hours of manual labor over which the toiler has no option. Indeed, it would seem from the above quotation that the president of Harvard is lacking in the degree of imagination that it is

absolutely necessary for a critic to possess in order that he may at least measurably place himself in the position of those he assumes to criticize.

We do not doubt that the great educator finds joy in his labor, nor do we question that he works hard and faithfully in meeting the many duties imposed by his responsible position; but his work is of a nature entirely unlike that of the mass of those he criticizes, in that it is not only performed under pleasant conditions and in a congenial atmosphere, but it is of such a character that the imagination is constantly fed, the brain stimulated as well as fatigued, while the body is not kept on a strain that produces constant weariness. Moreover, if his life becomes too sedentary he has the power to take necessary physical exercise; while his compensation in honor and position is a factor in increasing his satisfaction in his labor, and his remuneration for services rendered is sufficiently large to remove all fear of poverty, want, or starvation in case of sickness, adversity, or misfortune. Under such conditions congenial work may be a source of perpetual joy; but, on the other hand, let us suppose that President Eliot should suddenly be overtaken by an adverse fate that compelled him to spend ten hours a day working in the coal mines of Pennsylvania, and to live as one who earns what the average miner earns is compelled to live. Then suppose that after a month of toil there he should be taken to the puddler's inferno, which is such a source of wealth to the magnates of the steel trust. Let us suppose that here he is compelled to strip and stand before those white-hot furnaces, toiling even but a few hours every day, with the heat scorching his eyes and drying his flesh. And then, after a month in the foundries, suppose he is transferred to one of the great factories where he is compelled to tend some machines for ten hours a day amid a ceaseless din and roar of looms and machinery. After this experience, unless I am very much mistaken in the measure of his manhood, the president of Harvard would be one of the most zealous advocates of the shorter day for manual workers.

The work demanded of the great majority of the men fighting for shorter hours is a work that is marked by drudging monotony, exhausting in its influence on the body, and devoid of those things that afford restful stimulation for brain and imagination. It is work that unfits a man to joy in life if the day be of long duration. It is work that discourages mental, moral, and imaginative growth; and any conditions in the

twentieth century, in a nation of such vast wealth and resources as ours, that do not favor this normal unfoldment are essentially immoral and indefensible, while they are also a deadly peril to the cause of true democracy.

Furthermore, President Eliot charges the trade-unions with urging every individual to produce as little as he can and to get as much money as he can for it. If this assertion were wholly true, the fact would not be surprising, however regrettable; for it would be simply an illustration of an attempt to meet a systematic effort that has been carried on for generations on the part of the exploiters of labor to make the toilers produce as much as possible for as small pay as possible. But the statement, as we have already seen, so far as it relates to the effort of the present-day American trade-unions to seek to induce the individual to produce as little as possible, is inaccurate; while concerning the charge that the unions seek to secure for their members the largest possible wage, we would respectfully ask President Eliot what there is wrong in their doing so. Indeed, is it not their duty to secure for the workers at least the small part of the wealth they create that shall enable them as well as their exploiters to own a home, to educate their children, to carry a life insurance, to accumulate a little competency against age and sickness, and to enjoy a reasonable amount of leisure, recreation, and intercourse with family and friends?

A few weeks ago I had occasion to visit some of the great buildings of Harvard University in company with a friend, and we also visited some of the elegantly appointed dormitories or apartments occupied by students who are sons of the rich. The wealth-creators of America are conversant with the fact that the sons of their exploiters are enjoying, not only the advantages of the best educational institutions of the land, but are enabled to live in a luxury that favors dissipation and moral enervation, very largely as a result of the special privileges, the "unearned increment," and the lion's share of the wealth created by labor; while the toilers in many instances are unable to amass enough to buy the humblest cottage or properly to educate their children.

Moreover, added to the weariness of body resulting from incessant toil, there is the perpetual fear that sickness and want will overtake them and their loved ones, or that some comrade's son may be secured by the enterprising exploiter as an apprentice to take his work. And yet the trade-unions are assailed

by the president of one of the greatest and richest universities in America for seeking to secure more equitable remuneration for manual toilers!

There are some other points in President Eliot's arraignment of the trade-unions that should be fully examined, but space renders this impossible. The points we have touched upon show how extremely difficult it is for a person to run counter to his prejudices and the prejudices of his associates, especially when the institution to which he belongs is beholden in a real way to one of the warring factions in the great oncoming economic struggle that will make the twentieth century forever memorable in the annals of civilization.

* * *

THE POSTAL BUREAUCRACY REBUKED BY THE HIGHER COURTS.

On November 17 Justice Peckham of the Supreme Court of the United States rendered an important decision calculated to check the unconstitutional usurpations of the Post-Office Department in arrogating powers not intended to be conveyed to the executive departments by the lawmakers of the land, and which have been used to harass Reform, Socialistic, and New Thought publications that are unacceptable to the political and religious opinions of Mr. Madden.

The following press despatch, sent from Washington on the occasion of this triumph of justice over one of the gravest infractions of the principles of free government that have marked the modern imperialistic Administrations, gives the principal facts involved:

"WASHINGTON, D. C., Nov. 17.—The Post-Office Department has no right to brand as a fraud or refuse the mails to a business simply because the Postmaster-General and a large proportion of the people do not believe in its methods. The fact of the fraud must be proved beyond a doubt before the postal department can take action. This is the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, delivered to-day by Justice Peckham.

"The ruling, which is important as giving recognition to the right of people to follow their own ideas in regard to methods of curing disease, was in the case of Prof. Weltmer's American School of Magnetic Healing *vs.* J. M. McAnnulty, the latter being postmaster at the town of Nevada, Mo., where the school is located.

"The proceeding grew out of a fraud order issued by the Post-

Office Department prohibiting the postmaster from delivering mail addressed to the school. The original bill asked for an injunction to prohibit the postmaster from obeying this order. On trial in the United States Circuit Court for the Western District of Missouri the Department's order was sustained on a demurrer. To-day's opinion reversed that judgment, but in delivering it Justice Peckham said that there was no intention of passing upon the various constitutional objections set out in the bill, the intention of the Court being 'simply to hold that the admitted facts show no violation of the statutes cited, but an erroneous order given by the Postmaster-General to the defendant, which the courts have the power to grant relief against.'

"The action of the Court was accompanied with instructions to the lower court to 'overrule the defendant's demurrer to the amended bill, with leave to answer and to grant a temporary injunction as applied for by complainants.'

"The opinion added: 'In overruling the demurrer, we do not mean to preclude the defendant from showing on the trial, if he can, that the business of complainants as in fact conducted amounts to a violation of the statutes.'

"Justices White and McKenna did not concur in the opinion.

"In reviewing the case Justice Peckham quoted the plea of the magnetic school that one human mind may control another in treating disease, and said:

"'One person may believe it of greater efficacy than another, but surely it cannot be said that it is a fraud for one person to contend that the mind has an effect upon the body and its physical condition greater than even a vast majority of intelligent people might be willing to admit or believe. Even intelligent people may and do differ among themselves as to the extent of this mental effect. Because the complainants might or did claim to be able to effect cures by reason of working upon and effecting the mental powers of the individual and directing them toward the accomplishment of a cure of the disease under which he might be suffering, who can say that it is a fraud or false pretense or promise within the meaning of the statutes? How can any one lay down the limit and say beyond that there are fraud and false pretenses? The claim of the ability to cure may be vastly greater than most men would be ready to admit, and yet those who might deny the existence or virtue of the remedy would only differ in opinion from those who assert it. There is no exact standard of absolute truth by which to prove the assertion false and a fraud.'

Many people have felt that Mr. Madden's systematic attack on various Mental Science, New Thought, and Socialistic publications was in part due to the fact that he belongs to the Roman Catholic Church, whose hostility to all these theories and philosophies is so pronounced; and in view of this fact we greatly regret to note that the only two Judges of the Su-

preme Bench who are mentioned as dissenting from the opinion rendered by the majority are the two members of the Roman Church on the Supreme Bench.

The above decision is, of course, not the ultimate ruling on the merit of the case; but the facts laid down in the opinion prove that the Court is in accord with the Publishers' Bureau and others who have opposed the systematic attempt to usurp the functions of lawmaker and judge that has marked the rulings and actions of Mr. Madden in so many instances of late.

In the above case the Court refuses to permit the Department to arrogate the right to judge as to what is good and what is not good for the people, where there are widely divergent opinions among good citizens.

In another important decision, rendered on December 3, the District Court of Appeals at Washington made two decisions against the rulings of the Department on the publications of the National Railway Publication Company and the Railway List Company.

It will be remembered that Mr. Madden, after several years of unavailing attempts to secure certain legislation that in the opinion of Congress would be unwise and prejudicial to the best interests of the country, deliberately sought to gain, by a series of arbitrary rulings, the object that by his own confession Congress had refused to grant. Thus the Department usurped the legislative functions of the Government, and it is not strange that the courts refused to uphold such action.

The recent decisions of the Supreme Court and those of the District Court of Appeals are extremely valuable, because they will necessarily be a check to the attempt to establish an odious bureaucracy, as absolute and despotic in spirit as that which curses Russia.

If the same efforts as have been put forth by the Post-Office Department to prevent publications building up large circulations through giving premiums and sending out sample copies had been expended in an attempt to cut down the enormous and extortionate rates paid by the Government to the railway companies—which is one of the most crying scandals in public life to-day—the Post-Office Department would in all probability be making a far better showing financially; while the immensely valuable educational influence of the Department would not have been hampered through the un-American and reactionary policy that has marked the Post-Office Department during the last six years.

THE IMPORTANCE OF MAJORITY RULE.

The underlying principles of free government are permanent and immutable. Freedom, justice, fraternity, equality of opportunity, and equality before the law—these things are basic and unchangeable. But to preserve the victories won, to conserve the great cause, to approach nearer and still nearer the glorious ideal that was the pillar of cloud by day and the pillar of fire by night to the master spirits who led the people out from the Egypt of imperialism, absolutism, and kingcraft—such is the high mission of the true statesman and the most solemn obligation devolving on the citizen where, as in a democracy, the destiny of the people lies in the ballot of the electorate.

The changed conditions of the last fifty years have rendered it not only expedient but absolutely necessary, if free institutions are to be preserved and if the Republic is to be in fact as well as in theory a government of the people, by the people, and for the people, that certain safeguards be thrown out to preserve popular government from the corrupt aggressions of corporate wealth and the subtle reactionary spirit that seeks to reestablish the old immoral "divine right" idea on the throne of a people's government. This is not saying, of course, that the attempt to revive the idea of the divine right of kings is contemplated. The divine right of property, or the establishment of property rights over the inherent and inalienable rights of man, is merely another form of the same tyranny that ever wars against justice, freedom, and fraternity. And during the last thirty or forty years so great has been the rise of the aristocracy of the dollar or the plutocracy in this country, so aggressive and immoral has been its influence in politics, and so rapidly but quietly has it gained ownership, control, or influence over various public opinion-forming agencies, that municipal, State, and national scandals have followed one another in rapid succession; while millions are oppressed and plundered by monopolies and corporations in the presence of a government that, when not cynically indifferent, pleads the baby act of helplessness. During this period the machine, the partizan boss, and the corporation—a trinity of darkness—have become a deadly peril to free government.

To meet this emergency it is of vital importance that government be carried back to the people, that the power to initiate and to veto legislation be given in fact to the voters, and that

the farce of special interests ruling a country under the pretext of popular government shall cease.

This is precisely what Majority Rule secures to the people. It is merely the realization of republican or democratic ideals of government in their most perfect expression, and the only way in which the usurpation of public government by unscrupulous party bosses, corrupt machines, and equally corrupt corporate wealth can be destroyed.

* * *

MR. ROCKEFELLER AS AN EDUCATOR, AND THE LATEST LESSON OF THE STANDARD OIL TRUST.

The following incident, which is said to have occurred in the State of Maine, is highly suggestive and illustrates the way in which the master spirits in the modern trusts and corporations, whose millions have been largely amassed through possessing the power to plunder the wealth-creators of the Republic, systematically pose as patrons of religion and benefactors of the race.

A well-known and somewhat shrewd-minded resident of one of the rural districts of the Pine Tree State had managed to eke out a fairly good living by peddling various articles. Once a week he made the rounds of his circuit with his oil cart. At such times the farmers were accustomed to replenish their oil cans. The hawker was noted for ever being ready with an answer for all questions, and when the requisite knowledge was not at hand his inventive imagination usually suggested a plausible explanation. On one of his trips, which occurred shortly after the daily press and a large number of the religious journals had been filled with extravagant and fulsome laudations of Mr. Rockefeller because of some recent donations to certain colleges and religious institutions, the hawker informed his patrons that the price of oil had advanced a cent a gallon. In reply to the indignant demand for the reason of this advance, he said: "Why, you see, it is just this way: Mr. Rockefeller has lately given some hundreds of thousands of dollars to some religious or educational institutions, and so he has had to secure an advance in the price of oil. Of course," he added, shrewdly, "if the price keeps up Mr. Rockefeller's

share of the increase will be a great deal more than the amount he has given; but I reckon that will not trouble him much."

Since the price of coal advanced as a result of the shameful arrogance of the criminal coal and railroad trust, the demand for petroleum for heating purposes has greatly increased, and as a result coal oil that was selling at wholesale on September 20 at seven and one-half cents a gallon has been four times advanced, so that exactly three months later, on December 20, we find it selling at wholesale at eleven and one-half cents, or more than half as much again as it was selling for before the extremity of the people made this rank robbery possible.

It is not surprising, therefore, that Mr. Rockefeller is again posing as a great philanthropist by propositions for extensive educational benefactions, thereby again calling forth extravagant and fulsome praise from the corporation-owned press. The circumstance that the proposed gifts will be a moiety of his share of the money that will be wrung from the shivering millions of the Republic if the present increase in the price of oil is maintained—that they represent the plunder of the poor: extortion that has greatly augmented the misery of the multitude—is entirely overlooked by the press and the pulpit that have assumed the rôle of apologists for the rapacity of the corporations.

The circumstance that the richest trust or corporation in the New World, and one whose returns on oil were princely when the price was seven and one-half cents a gallon, seizes upon the opportunity presented by the helplessness and misery of our people to extort a sum that, based on the annual sales, will amount to over \$93,000,000, proves the essential brutality and moral obloquy of the master minds that manage this vast aggregation of wealth; and the further fact that the leading spirit of this trust has in no way sought to curb its rapacity or prevent it from wringing millions out of the suffering and freezing poor envelops in a Tatarian shadow all his so-called gifts for religion or education.

If the people owned and operated, as they should own and manage, the natural monopolies and the great storehouses of natural wealth given by the beneficent Creator for all His children, this shameful robbery of the millions for the further enrichment of the dangerously overrich few would be impossible. And furthermore, if the Government was not so recreant to its trust that it failed to safeguard the rights of the people and protect the weak from the rapacity of the shrewd and un-

scrupulous strong, we would not to-day have the spectacle of the masses of America the helpless victims of the insatiable greed of the coal trust, the oil trust, the beef trust, and other similar predatory bands.

Happily for the Republic there are many signs of a change; and this very criminal indifference of government and the shameful oppression of the people by corporate wealth is compelling millions to think who have heretofore been content to be led by the paid advocates and tools of "the masters of the bread." And it may be that the very insolence and brutality of the trusts and monopolies, and the cynical indifference of government to the rights of the exploited millions, will prove in the end the salvation of democracy from the despotism of plutocracy.

BOOKS OF THE DAY.

REVIEWED BY B. O. FLOWER.*

SWORDS AND PLOWSHARES. By Ernest Crosby. Cloth, 126 pp. Price, \$1 net. New York: Funk & Wagnalls Company.

I. THE FUNCTION OF THE PROPHET IN NATIONAL CRISES.

In the history of the children of Israel one fact ever deeply impressed me, and that was that whenever ambition, lust for power, greed for wealth, animal appetites and desires blinded the people to the solemn duty devolving on men and nations, causing injustice and oppression to occupy the seats of equity and righteousness, there arose great prophets, whose voices rang throughout the nation with something of the strength and suggestiveness of primeval life. These men spoke to the conscience of the people; they appealed to the sleeping divinity in the heart of man; they denounced alike the rulers and the priesthood, who were both recreant to the demands of righteousness and justice. They often offended conventionalism, which ever desires of her teachers that they prophesy smooth things. They were ridiculed, sneered at, and persecuted by the scribes, Pharisees, and rulers. Often they were slain or driven from their land by entrenched injustice and triumphant greed. Their work, however, was never in vain. Even when their warning words were not received by the people they awakened the divine in some chosen minds, who henceforth consecrated their lives to the divine ideal enunciated by the elder prophet; and thus, tocsin-like, the message continued to sound, until the sleeping people awakened in its strength and renewed its covenant with the truth.

The history of Israel has been the history of all the great nations of earth. So long as the prophet is powerful and his warnings are heeded, the nation lives. When his voice fails to rouse the conscience of the people, then, in deed and in truth, has the night settled over the land.

And what has been true of the past is equally true to-day. Here, for example, in America, the Republic is passing through a supreme crisis. The lower is battling against the higher; brute power is being exalted over moral courage; greed for gold and an insane mania for dominion are fighting against the very fundamentals of free government. The fatal idea of the divine right of property is being exalted over the fundamental demands of justice and the inalienable right of

*Books intended for review in THE ARENA should be addressed to B. O. Flower, 5 Park Square, Boston, Mass.

manhood. Lust for wealth is filling our factories with women who should grace and glorify happy homes, and with little children whose rightful place is in the schoolroom and on the playground. The great daily papers, having become the channels for wealth's advertisements, have thereby become slaves where they should be masters. The colleges, universities, and churches are on every hand receiving donations from the new feudalism of wealth, and with the acceptance of this acquired gold there seems to come a tacit understanding that education and religion alike shall become blind to social injustice and economic crimes, by which the millions are being exploited for the enrichment of the few. Or, if the educators and the clergy see at all, it is only after they have put on the spectacles of the feudal barons, becoming thereby apologists for wrong.

Hence, it is clear that there never was an hour when the voice of the prophet was more urgently needed in the land; and, happily for our Republic, a growing group of prophets is voicing the eternal verities and calling to the conscience and soul of the nation as did the Elijahs, the Isaiahs, and the Daniels of the olden time.

Among this noble coterie of servants of progress and sons of the dawn, no voice rings out clearer or with truer tone than that of Ernest Crosby. In his utterances is found the consuming love that is all-important, married to a moral courage before which the courage of the slayers of bodies sinks into pitiful insignificance.

In his new volume, "Swords and Plowshares," our author in the voice of a very Isaiah denounces the crimes of the war of criminal aggression that has stained the flag of the Republic. He boldly arraigns that double spirit of death—the mania for taking life and the materialism of the market that subordinates all things to the acquisition of gold. He appeals to the moral side of life and pleads for peace and brotherhood with that rugged power born of sincerity and a passionate love of all life.

II. PROTESTS AGAINST WAR.

To a man like Mr. Crosby, who believes in following Jesus' teachings rather than pretending to do so while denying the Master at every turn, the hypocrisy of those who at once champion war and claim to be Christians is so offensive that he is moved to protest in these timely and suggestive words:

Talk, if you will, of hero deed,
Of clash of arms and battle wonders;
But prate not of your Christian creed
Preached by the cannon's murderous thunders.

And if your courage needs a test,
Copy the pagan's fierce behavior;
Revel in bloodshed east and west,
But speak not of it with the Savior.

The Turk may wage a righteous war
 In honor of his martial Allah;
 But Thor and Odin live no more—
 Dead are the gods in our Valhalla.

Be what you will, entire and free,
 Christian or warrior—each can please us;
 But not the rank hypocrisy
 Of warlike followers of Jesus.

Our author believes that there are no such things as good wars. He holds that violence can only degrade a noble cause, and "that violence, however employed, drives out all liberty and love at the end." His views on this point are well set forth in these lines on our Civil War:

But, you say, there have been good wars.

Never, never, never!

As I look back at our "good" war—at the indelible bloody splash upon our history—the four years' revel of hatred—the crowded shambles of foiled Secession—

I see that it was all a pitiable error.

That which we fought for, the Union of haters by force, was a wrong, misleading cause: the worship of bigness, the measure of greatness by latitude and longitude.

A single town true enough to abhor slaughter as well as slavery would have been better worth dying for than all that tempestuous domain.

From the seed then sown grew up imperialism and militarism and capitalism and a whole forest of stout, deep-rooted ills in whose shadow we lead an unhealthy, stunted life to-day.

The incidental good—the freedom of the slaves, illusive, unsubstantial freedom at best, freedom by law but not from the heart—does it really quite balance the scales?

Very fine and suggestive is the thought expressed in these lines:

The old, old dream of empire—

The dream of Alexander and Cæsar, of Tamerlane and Genghis Khan—

The dream of subject peoples carrying out our sovereign will through fear—

The dream of a universe forced to converge upon us—

The dream of pride and loftiness justified by strength of arms—

The dream of our arbitrary "Yea" overcoming all "Nays" whatsoever—

The dream of a cold, stern, hated machine of an empire!

But there is a more enticing dream:

The dream of wise freedom made contagious—

The dream of gratitude rising from broken fetters—

The dream of coercion laid prostrate once for all—

The dream of nations in love with each other without a thought of a common hatred or danger—

The dream of tyrants stripped of their tyrannies and oppressors deplored of their prey—

The dream of a warm, throbbing, one-hearted empire of brothers!

And will such a life be insipid when war has ceased forever?

Be not afraid.

Do lovers find life insipid?

Is there no hero-stuff in lovers?

To the champions of torture and savagery, who denounce the apostles of freedom and the true defenders of the honor of the flag as traitors, Mr. Crosby thus replies in a little waif entitled "The Flag":

Who has hauled down the flag?

Is it the men who still uphold
The principles for which it stood;
Who claim that ever as of old
Freedom is universal good?

Or is it those who spurn the way
That Washington and Lincoln trod;
Who seek to make the world obey,
And long to wield the master's rod?

Who boast of freedom, but prepare
Shackles and chains for distant shores,
Who make the flag the emblem there
Of all that Liberty abhors?

These have hauled down the flag!

In some stanzas entitled "The Pirate Flag" we have some lines of power embodying in a strikingly vivid manner the spirit of our war of criminal aggression, with its brutal slaughter of old and young, its laying waste of fruitful plains, its burning of villages, and its torture and murder of prisoners. The pictures drawn are far from pleasant. Would they were not true!—

I had an ugly dream last night,
And I was far away,
A-sailing on a man-of-war
Far up Manila Bay.
And as I cast a glance aloft
It made me stand aghast
To see a jet-black pirate flag
A-flying from the mast.

And then around me fore and aft
The guns began to roar,
And flames sprang up and soon enwrapped
A village on the shore.
I took my glass and clearly saw
Women and children run,
While soldiers in the palms behind
Were potting them for fun.

Far to the left some dusky men
Fought bravely on a knoll,
But, overcome at last, they raised
A white rag on a pole;
Yet still the soldiers shot them down
And I could almost hear
Their laughter as they seemed to shout,
"No prisoners wanted here!"

Then when the last defender fell
The men rushed in with glee,
And from each house they came with loads
Of plunder sad to see;
And soon we sent a boat ashore—
Blue-jackets and marines—
To get our share of loot and swag,
And spoil the Philippines.

I turned and asked a sailor lad—
For now they stood at ease—
What pirates we might chance to be
Who plagued these summer seas.
"Oh, we're no pirates," he replied,
"Don't ask me that again;
This is a ship of Uncle Sam
And we are Dewey's men."

"But how is that?" I said once more;
"Where are our stripes and stars?
And does this inky flag up there
Belong to honest tars?"
"To tell the truth, it's rather queer,"
Replied embarrassed Jack,
"But something in the climate here
Has turned Old Glory black.

"We wash her in the briny sea
And in the streams on land;
We scrub her with the best of soap,
And rub her in the sand;
And all our Chinese laundrymen
And all our laundry maids
Have tackled her, but still she looks
Black as the ace of spades.

"There's something in the climate here
That changes things around,
And what the reason of it is
We none of us have found.
And so we don't know what to say,
Or even what to think,
When people ask us what has made
Old Glory black as ink."

Just then the boat came back from shore
Well laden down with spoil—
With goods that told of many years
Of Filipino toil;
And Jack ran off to get his part,
Nor came he ever back,
And I awoke and never learned
What turned Old Glory black.

The above extracts will serve to give our readers a fair idea of the author's poems and word pictures touching war. We now turn to a brighter page.

III. SONGS OF PEACE AND PROGRESS.

One of the most beautiful poems in the work is entitled "Peace," from which we take the following stanzas:

Peace, O Peace, when will the nation
Lift its eyes and understand
How thou holdest all creation
In the hollow of thy hand?

Thine the strength that stays the ocean
Hypnotized within its bed;
Thine the power that keeps in motion
Constellations overhead.

Thine the orb of love afire,
Lighting up the heavens profound;
Thine the suns that never tire
Swinging planets round and round;

* * * *

Thine the strength, serene, unshaken,
Which can master self alone,
Quelling passions when they waken,
From thy calm, eternal throne.

* * * *

Teach us, while the battle rages,
What we never understood:
This the mystery of the ages—
Evil overcome by good.

Far above the storms and thunders,
Far above the war and strife,
Far above our sins and blunders,
At the source of strength and life—

There I see thy hand commanding
With the olive branch for rod,
Peace, that passest understanding!
Spirit of Almighty God!

And here is an excellent characterization of the true leader:

And this shall ever be the sign
To mark the leader true:
The poet is the man divine
Who tells us something new—

The man who tells us something new,
And points the road ahead;
Whose tent is with the forward few,
And not among the dead.

One of the sweetest and most tender little conceits is entitled "Love's Patriot":

I saw a lad, a beautiful lad,
 With a far-off look in his eye,
 Who smiled not on the battle-flag
 When the cavalry troop marched by.

And, sorely vexed, I asked the lad
 Where might his country be
 Who cared not for our country's flag
 And the brave from oversea?

"Oh, my country is the Land of Love,"
 Thus did the lad reply;
 "My country is the Land of Love,
 And a patriot there am I."

"And who is your king, my patriot boy,
 Whom loyally you obey?"
 "My king is Freedom," quoth the lad,
 "And he never says me nay."

"Then you do as you like in your Land of Love,
 Where every man is free?"
 "Nay, we do as we love," replied the lad;
 And his smile fell full on me.

In literary form and the ruggedness of his expression Mr. Crosby constantly reminds one of Walt Whitman, while his ethical exaltation likewise frequently suggests the writings of Count Tolstoy. These facts are well brought out in the following lines:

Since my soul has become brother to the lowest, its pride knows no bounds.
 It looks down on kingship and empire, on rule and mastery, on laws and institutions, on the ambitions and successes of men.
 It condescends to mountains and oceans, to suns and constellations, to time and space.
 It feels equal to the sum total of all things, of all excellencies and grandeurs.
 It bows to nothing and nobody, and finds all that is worshipful in itself.
 When my soul became brother to the lowest, it feared to lose the tiny atom that it was, and instead of that it has expanded into a universe.
 All this has happened since my soul became brother to the lowest.

Ho! for the pride of democracy!
 The other prides of kings and aristocrats shrivel up before it.
 We fold up the tinsel muslin and lay aside the gilded crowns that played their part so long.
 Let it strut no more—the pride that sucked its strength from the abasement of brother men.
 It was a bastard pride, a usurping, base-born pride.

But the new pride comes in its place:
 The pride of typifying all humanity, of being an integral part of it, of embracing and sharing it from the lowest to the highest;
 The pride of being brother to the tramp and the prostitute as well as to the queen and the conqueror;

The pride of being a representative bit of the universe and of compassing its entire span;
 The pride that takes from no one but gives to all, that debases no one but raises all—
 The pride of being universal and infinite and eternal!
 Ho! for the bottomless, topless pride of democracy!

In the lines entitled "Godward" is found the essence of the coming religion, the religion of life, of joy, of growth:

Truth—vague to the mind, invisible, elusive, impalpable—
 Incarnate in life alone is it to be grasped and handled.
 Only as love do I recognize truth, for truth precipitated in life is love.
 Love is truth alive—quickened, concentrated, vivid, intense.
 Do you yearn for intensity and concentration? You will find these only in love.
 Argument, theory, speculation—these are false doors, and conduct us not to the citadel of truth.
 They open upon the plains of diffusion, dissipation, disintegration.
 They lead to the somnolent, hazy hinterland of life on the confines of the desert of death.
 Stop babbling and live.
 Love—and feel the truth.
 Live Godlike and feel God.

IV. SOCIAL PSALMS AND PROTESTS.

The present is big with social protest. The new conscience is everywhere raising its cry against injustice, inhumanity, and the spoliation of the poor. Very clear and vivid is the following epitome of social wrongs born of inequality of opportunity and privilege. It embodies in a large way the soul of the new protest of the conscience of civilization against the new feudalism of wealth:

I passed the plate in church.
 There was little silver, but the crisp bank-notes heaped themselves up high before me;
 And ever as the pile grew, the plate became warmer and warmer, until it fairly burned my fingers, and a smell of scorching flesh rose from it, and I perceived that some of the notes were beginning to smolder and curl, half-browned, at the edges.
 And then I saw through the smoke into the very substance of the money, and I beheld what it really was:
 I saw the stolen earnings of the poor, the wide margin of wages pared down to starvation;
 I saw the underpaid factory girl eking out her living on the street, and the overworked child, and the suicide of the discharged miner;
 I saw poisonous gases from great manufactories spreading disease and death;
 I saw despair and drudgery filling the dram-shop;
 I saw rents screwed out of brother men for permission to live on God's land;
 I saw men shut out from the bosom of the earth and begging for the poor privilege to work in vain, and becoming tramps and paupers and drunkards and lunatics, and crowding into almshouses, insane asylums, and prisons;
 I saw ignorance and vice and crime growing rank in stifling, filthy slums;

I saw usury, springing from usury, itself again born of unjust monopoly and purchased laws and legalized violence;
 I saw shoddy cloth and adulterated food and lying goods of all kinds, cheapening men and women and vulgarizing the world;
 I saw hideousness extending itself from coal-mine and foundry over forest and river and field;
 I saw money grabbed from fellow-grabbers and swindled from fellow-swindlers, and underneath them the workman forever spinning it out of his vitals;
 I saw all the laboring world, thin and pale and bent and care-worn and driven, pouring out this tribute from its toil and sweat into the laps of the richly dressed men and women in the pews, who only glanced at them to shrink from them with disgust;
 I saw money worshiped as a god, and given grudgingly from hoards so great that it could be missed, as a bribe from superstition to a dishonest judge in the expectation of escaping hell.
 I saw all this, and the plate burned my fingers so that I had to hold it first in one hand and then in the other; and I was glad when the parson in his white robes took the smoking pile from me on the chancel steps and, turning about, lifted it up and laid it on the altar.
 It was an old-time altar indeed, for it bore a burnt offering of flesh and blood—a sweet savor unto the Moloch whom these people worship with their daily round of human sacrifices.
 The shambles are in the temples as of yore, and the tables of the money-changers waiting to be overturned.

And here also are some words for the times taken from a social psalm entitled "Bread and Justice":

Bitter to eat is the bread that was made by slaves.
 In the fair white loaf I can taste their sweat and tears.
 My clothes strangle and oppress me; they burn into my flesh, for I have not justly earned them, and how are they clad that made them?
 My tapestried walls and inlaid floors chill me and hem me in like the damp stones of a prison house, for I ask why the builders and weavers of them are not living here in my stead.
 Alas! I am eating the fruit of the forbidden tree, the tree of others' labor!

Is the bread question so low and material?
 Are the men so very wrong who claim that, with bread for all who deserve it, paradise would be fairly inaugurated?
 To withhold bread is injustice. Is injustice material?
 To give bread where it is due is justice. Has justice nothing to do with soul?
 Bread is the symbol of justice and righteousness.
 Honest bread is the staff of life of the spirit as well as of the body.
 Justice—plain bread justice—is the only atmosphere in which a healthy soul of a man or of a people can thrive.

The question of child slavery is happily being much agitated at the present time in this country, where, to the disgrace of the Republic, tens of thousands of little ones are being compelled to drudge their childhood hours away instead of enjoying the benefits of education and a care-free life at a formative period. Mr. Crosby touches upon this crying wrong in these suggestive lines, which should be read wherever

there are men and women whose hearts go out to the little ones as did the love of the Great Nazarene when he trod the barren plains of Galilee:

Br-r-r-r-r-r-r!

What are the machines saying—a hundred of them in one long room? They must be talking to themselves, for I see no one else for them to talk to.

But yes, there is a boy's red head bending over one of them, and beyond I see a pale face fringed with brown curly locks.

There are only five boys in all on this floor, half hidden by the clattering machines, for one bright lad can manage twenty-five of them.

Each machine makes one cheap, stout sock in five minutes, without seam, complete from toe to ankle, cutting the thread at the end and beginning another of its own accord.

The boys have nothing to do but to clean and burnish and oil the steel rods and replace the spools of yarn.

But how rapidly and nervously they do it—the slower hands straining to accomplish as much as the fastest!

Working at high tension for ten hours a day in the close, greasy air and endless whirr—

Boys who ought to be out playing ball in the fields or taking a swim in the river this fine summer afternoon.

And in these good times the machines go all night, and other shifts of boys are kept from their beds to watch them.

The young girls in the mending and finishing rooms down-stairs are not so strong as the boys.

They have an unaccountable way of fainting and collapsing in the noise and smell, and then they are of no use for the rest of the day.

The kind stockholders have had to provide a room for collapsed girls and to employ a doctor, who finds it expedient not to understand this strange new disease.

Perhaps their children will be more stalwart in the next generation.

Yet this factory is one of the triumphs of our civilization.

With only twenty-five boys at a time at the machines in all the rooms it produces five thousand dozen pairs of socks in twenty-four hours for the toilers of the land.

It would take an army of fifty thousand hand-knitters to do what these small boys perform.

Br-r-r-r-r-r-r!

What are the machines saying?

They are saying: "We are hungry.

We have eaten up the men and women (there is no longer a market for men and women, they come too high)—

We have eaten up the men and women, and now we are devouring the boys and girls.

How good they taste as we suck the blood from their rounded cheeks and forms, and cast them aside sallow and thin and care-worn, and then call for more!"

The devil has somehow got into the machines.

They came like the good gnomes and fairies of old, to be our willing slaves and make our lives easy.

Now that, by their help, one man can do the work of a score, why have we not plenty for all, with only enough work to keep us happy?

Who could have foreseen all the ills of our factory workers and of those who are displaced and cast aside by factory work?

The good wood and iron elves came to bless us all, but some of us have succeeded in bewitching them to our own ends and turning them against the rest of mankind.

We must break the sinister charm and win over the docile, tireless machines until they refuse to shut out a single human being from their benefits.

We must cast the devil out of the machines.

We close these selections with a very suggestive little waif entitled "The Tyrants' Song":

'Tis not the man with match alight
Behind the barricade,
Nor he who stoops to dynamite,
That makes us feel afraid.
For halter-end and prison-cell
Soon quench these brief alarms;
But where are found the means to quell
The man with folded arms?

We dread the man who folds his arms
And tells the simple truth,
Whose strong, impetuous protest charms
The virgin ear of youth,
Who scorns the vengeance that we wreak,
And smiles to meet his doom,
Who on the scaffold still can speak,
And preaches from the tomb.

We kill the man with dagger drawn—
The man with loaded gun;
They never see the morning dawn
Nor hail the rising sun;
But who shall slay the immortal man
Whom nothing mortal harms,
Who never fought and never ran—
The man with folded arms?

The last pages of the volume are given to Nature poems and farm pictures. Space forbids our quoting from them, and we can only say that many of these lines are very beautiful, and, like all Mr. Crosby's work, are thought-inspiring.

This is a noble volume—a valuable addition to the growing conscience literature of the twentieth century.

A BOOK OF MEDITATIONS. By Edward Howard Griggs. Cloth, 226 pp. Price, \$1.50 net. New York: B. W. Huebsch.

In this volume we have at once the inspiration of the prophet and the aspiration of the humanistic lover of truth. It is a work of exceptional merit that we can heartily recommend to all our readers, in the conviction that no one will be able to peruse its pages without having been made better and stronger for the reading.

It has been termed an autobiography of thoughts and impressions, and is introspective rather than superficial in character. It deals with

the subjective world and its aspirations and desires. It touches life on the moral and mental rather than on the material plane. It stimulates the intellectual man while feeding the soul. Such works are greatly needed at a time like the present, when material affairs engross so much of life. Almost every page contains something highly suggestive and positively helpful. The pulsation of the author's thought is in harmony with the higher aspirations of our dawning century. Take, for example, the following prose poem suggested to the author at midnight when in Paris. It is entitled "Humanity":

"Out upon the night-wind it is borne, faint, tremulous, rising into a deep swell of sound, shaking the fabric of the earth and reaching aloft to heaven—the sigh of suffering humanity. It shakes the throne of the despot, and weakens the foundations upon which Pride and Selfishness have built their seemingly eternal palaces. It rings in the ears of the dreamer and makes tremulous the heart of every lover of his fellow-men. More powerful than the wind that lashes the sea, more lasting than the ceaseless hum of toil, pitiable, insistent, menacing, it shall not go unheard and unanswered. The ear of God listens, the forces of the universe wait to leap into being to answer its need. Those who cause it shall be swept into ruin, and those who listen and seek to help shall attain a power no tyrant ever dreamed."

Here, too, are some words that remind one of the great Italian solitary, Mazzini. They are entitled "Freedom":

"We crave freedom, but freedom is never an end in itself; it is a means to be used for further aims. Its value lies in the extent to which it can assist the development of life. To possess freedom with no life for which to use it is the bitterest farce. One of the saddest situations in human experience comes when, having previously desired freedom, we discover that we have attained it just when the objects to which we had hoped to dedicate it are irrevocably lost. Life never means complete freedom, and every action and relation is an added bond. Life is to be attained, not through a non-moral freedom of caprice, but through a glad welcoming and loyal fulfilment of every bond and obligation which comes in the daily path of life."

The following lines on "Love" are very fine and true:

"Love is the everlasting worker of miracles. When all seems hopeless, and the soul is descending upon the road that has no turning, let it be awakened to love, and immediately all the forces of the spiritual world converge upon it to lift it toward God. Love is the savior, love is the perpetual wonder of life.

"The truest love can endure much and forgive all. It never wearies, it never despairs. It knows that in the end love will bring truth. With all its bitter longing, it can wait and suffer, and it never fails.

"The truest love is not merely the satisfaction of one aspect of human nature; it answers the whole life. It is the greatest of all joy-bringers and the most wonderful of educators. It can hold one to truth with a power that belongs to no other force. It is ever fresh and new like the morning and the flowers, for it is born anew in each experience, and the wonder it reveals to-day is a deep below deep in comparison to what seemed the infinite joy of yesterday."

And here is something well calculated to rouse even the shallow worldly-wise or butterfly-like mind out of its absorption in the superficial round of society life:

"The pink color fades from the light fleeces of cloud, the twilight descends over the city, in the street the crier calls the evening papers, the throng hastens homeward in the dusk:

"Men work or rest, but Time sweeps on!"

"The glory of Italy crumbles from the walls where fading frescoes decay, it broods over old churches and palaces like the fading light over the darkening city, it is buried in the countless pictures in which it descends from the past:

"The sun shines and is silent, but Time sweeps on!"

"The Greek is a splendid memory, the Egyptian and Assyrian a dim legend, the palaces of Nineveh are fallen, the splendors of Alexandria are sunk beneath the mud of the Nile. The Jew prays beside the weeping wall that sorrowfully whispers the past of Solomon, Babylon is lost in the mist, and Tyre and Carthage are but the vibrant echoes of a forgotten dream:

"Nations rise and fall, but Time sweeps on!"

"Where the Britons, clothed in skins, met under some ancient oak, there vast and gloomy cities vomit their poisonous breath. Where Alexander led his adventurous soldiers or Cleopatra met the legions of Rome, there English and German traders barter the machine-woven stuffs of to-day. Where cities stood the sand whirls in wild triumph, and the gardens in which lovers sang echo to some night beast of prey. The golden palace of Theodoric is shrunk to the fragment of a wall. The tomb of an emperor is the play-house of the mob. Causes for which men fought and died are forgotten, and the fighters, too, are locked in the vast embrace:

"Men live and die, but Time sweeps on!"

"The figures carved upon the graves of the Crusaders are worn smooth by innumerable feet. The walls of Venetian palaces which echoed to the laughter of gorgeous women are lipped by the silent kisses of the dead canals. The Forum where Cato and Cicero walked is sunk below the level of the street and littered with the stone waste of what once were temples:

"Men hate and love, but Time sweeps on!"

"On, on, relentlessly, unhurried by our passionate desires, unchecked by our wild regret, remorselessly, unheedingly, Time sweeps on. Carrying us with it in its merciless and exultant flood, or leaving us stranded like foam-bubbles upon the shore; sweeping vast civilizations into arrogant being, and surging over their last dying traces:

"Time ever sweeps on, and on, and on!"

These extracts will serve to indicate the lofty key in which the work is pitched and the deeply suggestive character of its contents. They are typical examples of the meditations that compose the 226 pages of the volume.

The work is excellently gotten up in all particulars save the absence of a table of contents or an index—an omission that is as surprising as it is annoying to the reader accustomed to an index, or at least to a table of contents.

CORNEILLE AND THE SPANISH DRAMA. By J. B. Segall, Ph.D. Cloth, 147 pp. Price, \$1.50 net. New York: The Columbia University Press; The Macmillan Company, Agents.

This is a brief but excellent work in which the author, after showing how greatly the literature of France of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was indebted to Spain, dwells especially on the overweening power of the Spanish stage over the French drama during the age of Corneille, and how the great French master borrowed plot and often thoughts and expressions from Spanish playwrights. Corneille's treatment was of course very different from that of the Spanish dramatists. The limitations imposed by classicism naturally fettered the great Frenchman, and it was only the genius of the author that invested the plays with lasting virility. The chapter comparing "Le Cid" with "Las Mocedades del Cid" is of special interest.

The volume is one of the series of Columbian University studies in romance, philology, and literature.

LITERARY NOTES.

A VERY valuable and suggestive little cloth-bound manual has recently appeared from the competent pen of Frank Cramer, the author of "Method of Darwin." It is entitled "Talks to Students on the Art of Study." (The Hoffman-Edwards Company, San Francisco.) "Skill," observes the author, "comes quickly only by attention to the method in which the thing is done." And this may be said to be the key-note of the book, which contains thirty chapters characterized throughout by practical and helpful instruction for the reader, and of especial value to the young whose habits of thought and action are being formed.

* * *

"FRANCEZKA," by Molly Elliot Seawell, is one of the new romantic novels recently brought out by the Bowen-Merrill Company. (Cloth, \$1.50.) It is a bright, well-written story, dealing for the most part with French life during the eighteenth century. It abounds in stirring deeds, though happily free from the exaggerations and the improbable not to say impossible situations characteristic of most of the modern so-called historical romantic novels. Lovers of a conventional romantic story of love and adventure, not untinged by sadness, will enjoy this volume, which is beautifully gotten up and embellished with a number of excellent drawings.

* * *

A VERY striking novel of modern life in the frivolous world of wealth and society appears in the December issue of "Tales from Town Topics," and is entitled "No Middle Ground." The author veils her identity under the *nom de plume* of Adam Adams. It is one of the most finished literary productions of the season, and at times is highly dramatic.

The story deals with the life of an extremely beautiful girl whose mother was a disreputable character. In her childhood the girl is befriended by the hero of the story after she has been accused of the murder of her mother. Stirred by interest in her pitiable condition and stimulated by the extraordinary beauty of the child, the hero becomes her guardian and places her in the hands of an accomplished and high-minded governess. He then fares forth to Europe, where he spends some years in the frivolous and somewhat dissipated life so common to the aristocratic dilettante. Returning, he finds that the governess of his ward has recently died, and the young woman, who has grown to be still more marvelously beautiful, awaits his direction and guidance. He succeeds in securing her a home in an excellent family and leaves to visit his own ultra-exclusive family in Boston. The pride of blood is the special weakness of his haughty mother, else it is probable that the guardian would have forthwith fallen in love with his beautiful, esthetic, and accomplished ward, as her attractions have greatly moved him. Knowing the scandal, however, that a marriage with a maiden whose antecedents were questionable, as were those of Cornilla, the ward, would cause, he battles with his ever-increasing passion. Later a young man who is rich and honorable falls deeply in love with the girl and is referred to her guardian. From early childhood Cornilla has idolized her benefactor. To be worthy of him and to meet his approval if not his love, she has struggled to be all he would have her, and his continued kindness has made of her a blind idolator. Hence, she cannot love the youth who is willing to marry her and trust to the future to fan into life the sacred flame. The guardian, though deeply attached to Cornilla, indeed though he regards her as the only woman he has ever truly loved, yet because of her antecedents shrinks from all thought of marrying her and urges her to insure her honor by marrying the man she does not love.

Here, to our mind, is the vital point in this book. It is one of the boldest exposures ever made of the loathsome immorality that conventionalism upholds as moral and honorable—this prostitution of love, this selling of the most sacred thing in life—if it be sheltered by a marriage certificate.

The heroine refuses to wed the man she does not love, and for a time yields to wayward love and becomes the mistress of her guardian. Later, after a period of terrible suffering arising from a frightful misunderstanding, the two are married, as Cornilla has come to mean everything to her guardian, and he recognizes that between the abyss of moral perdition and honorable marriage there is "no middle ground."

* * *

ONE of the most beautiful and attractive of the recent books for little folks is entitled "Life and Adventures of Santa Claus." It is written by Frank Baum and is published by the Bowen-Merrill Company. Though especially attractive as a Christmas present, it is one of those charmingly fascinating story-books that are suitable for a gift at any season of the

year, as it will prove a source of unfailing delight to the child. Strange, indeed, is the irresistible fascination for the youthful mind to be found in the fairy tales of Hans Christian Andersen and Grimm, in the "Arabian Nights," and in the wonder-stories of Santa Claus. Now, of all the fairy tales or wonder-stories for children we have read during the last decade, none possess greater charm than this delightfully told tale. The setting of the story is also worthy of the tale, as the book is illustrated with many full-page color plates and bound in handsome, decorated cloth.

NOTES AND ANNOUNCEMENTS.

OWING to the unusual length of some of the contributions and of our regular departments this month, and of the subsequent receipt of some material of very timely significance, we are obliged reluctantly to withhold for later publication the articles by Justice Walter Clark, John M. Berdan, Ph.D., and Axel Emil Gibson, announced for insertion in this issue of *THE ARENA*. Yet for contemporaneous human and national interest, variety of contents, and genuine service to the cause of social, economic, and political reform, the current number exceeds even the high standard set by that of last month, with which the Twenty-ninth Volume opened.

Our January symposium on "The Great Coal Strike and Its Lessons" elicited widespread comment and discussion, and several of this month's features have an indirect bearing on the coal problem, which has assumed almost a tragic import to thousands of our people. One of the contributors to the symposium sent us the following note soon after the appearance of the last issue:

*"Dear Sir—*There is a regrettable error in my article on the 'Coal Strike' in your current number—an error that only failed of correction before publication by an accident. I there state that there were more crimes of violence in the anthracite regions before the strike than during it. What I should have said was that there were more casualties in the mines before the strike, month for month, than those occasioned by the strike itself. It is not possible, however, to impute to the 'act of God' those accidents in the mines that result from the lack of proper appliances to prevent injury to the workmen. Yours truly,

"ERNEST H. CROSBY."

Edwin Maxey, LL.D., of Columbian University, whose article on the Venezuelan imbroglio has been assigned first place

in this number, has been added to our list of Special Contributors. His logical analysis of the true importance of the Monroe Doctrine in international affairs bears evidence of a trained legal mind, and his conclusions are significant aside from the probable outcome of the pending South American controversy.

Readers of THE ARENA, in common with all students of advanced sociology, are already familiar with Prof. Frank Parsons's views on questions relating to the public ownership of common utilities; but in this writer's article in the present issue some new facts and figures are given that are worth many volumes of theoretical discussion, and his proposition that the people must first *own their governments* is characteristically vital and important.

The essay on "The Labor Problem," by Horace Mann, M.S., was written for this magazine at the request of Commissioner Carroll D. Wright, of the Department of Labor, and the author's suggestions are offered as an aid in "destroying the evil in the trusts," a purpose to which President Roosevelt has recently committed himself.

In conformity with that spirit of fairness and justice which marks the editorial policy of THE ARENA, we give space this month to two articles by advocates of "woman's rights" that are of equal interest and educational value to our readers of the male sex. Mrs. Colby has a most congenial subject in Elizabeth Cady Stanton,—her history, work, and aims,—and presents many facts of a personal nature that serve to throw much new light on the steps by which has been developed the "woman of the period," whom Miss Merrick portrays in a way that is at once sprightly, vivid, and vigorous.

In addition to the papers already referred to for publication next month, our March number will contain a fine essay on Giuseppe Mazzini—the first of a series by Editor Flower on "Nineteenth Century Apostles of Progress"; "Zionism and Socialism," by Bernard G. Richards; "The Rights of Children," by Carrie L. Grout; "The Passing of Church Influence," by Duane Mowry, and a most suggestive article by J. W. Bennett, entitled "Democracy or Autocracy—Which?"

J. E. M.